Jerry Adams v. James Beal Appeal: 16-7135 Doc: 12 Filed: 02/03/2017 Pg: 1 of 3

Doc. 406384320

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-7135

JERRY L. ADAMS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

JAMES V. BEAL,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Michael F. Urbanski, District Judge. (7:15-cv-00594-MFU-RSB)

Submitted: January 31, 2017 Decided: February 3, 2017

Before WILKINSON, KEENAN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Jerry L. Adams, Appellant Pro Se. Robert H. Anderson, III, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jerry L. Adams seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. The 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 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 Adams has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny his motion for discovery, 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

Appeal: 16-7135 Doc: 12 Filed: 02/03/2017 Pg: 3 of 3

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

DISMISSED