Filed: 08/23/2016 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-6451

KEVIN MELLETTE,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

LEVERN COHEN,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Charleston. Bruce H. Hendricks, District Judge. (2:14-cv-00107-BHH)

Submitted: August 18, 2016 Decided: August 23, 2016

Before WILKINSON, KING, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Kevin Mellette, Appellant Pro Se. Donald John Zelenka, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Doc. 406167440

PER CURIAM:

Kevin Mellette seeks to appeal the district court's order the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing as untimely his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2012). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2012). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the petition states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Mellette has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are

Appeal: 16-6451 Doc: 5 Filed: 08/23/2016 Pg: 3 of 3

adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED