Larry Hooper v. Virginia Dept of Correction Doc. 406288688

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-6819

LARRY DEAN HOOPER,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS; HAROLD CLARK; CARL MANIS,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Anthony J. Trenga, District Judge. (1:14-cv-01460-AJT-IDD)

Submitted: October 31, 2016 Decided: November 21, 2016

Before WILKINSON, SHEDD, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Larry Dean Hooper, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

Dockets.Justia.com

PER CURIAM:

Larry Dean Hooper seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as untimely his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. The 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. Slack v. 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 Hooper has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny his motion to proceed as unnecessary, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the

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

DISMISSED