

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-7419**

---

BILLY SHANE TUCKER,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN, MCCORMICK CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION,

Respondent - Appellee,

and

LEROY CARTL,

Respondent.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Rock Hill. J. Michelle Childs, District Judge. (0:15-cv-04218-JMC)

---

Submitted: February 23, 2017

Decided: February 28, 2017

---

Before SHEDD and DIAZ, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Billy Shane Tucker, Appellant Pro Se. Donald John Zelenka, Senior Assistant Attorney General, James Anthony Mabry, Assistant Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Billy Shane Tucker seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on Tucker's 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 Tucker 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