

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-7064**

---

GEORGE H. SPIKER, JR.,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

HAROLD W. CLARKE,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western  
District of Virginia, at Roanoke. James P. Jones, District Judge.  
(7:15-cv-00379-JPJ-RSB)

---

Submitted: November 17, 2016                      Decided: November 22, 2016

---

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and MOTZ and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

George H. Spiker, Jr., Appellant Pro Se. John Watkins Blanton,  
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia,  
for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

George H. Spiker, Jr., seeks to appeal the district court's orders denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition and denying his motion for reconsideration. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). The orders are 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 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 Spiker 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

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

DISMISSED