Herman Belton v. Warden, Broad River Correction Appeal: 16-6936 Doc: 18 Filed: 02/02/2017 Pg: 1 of 3

## Doc. 406382105

## UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-6936

HERMAN BELTON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN, BROAD RIVER CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. J. Michelle Childs, District Judge. (6:15-cv-00262-JMC)

Submitted: January 31, 2017 Decided: February 2, 2017

Before WILKINSON, KEENAN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

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

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Herman Belton seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. See 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 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 Belton has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately

Appeal: 16-6936 Doc: 18 Filed: 02/02/2017 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED