Filed: 04/04/2017 Pg: 1 of 2

Doc. 406468013

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEAL	S
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT	

-		
<u>-</u>	No. 16-7515	
MICHAEL A. DUKES, a/k/a Mich	el A. Dukes, Sr.,	
Petitioner - Ap	ppellant,	
V.		
WILLIE L. EAGLETON, Warden,	etc,	
Respondent - A	Appellee.	
Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Rock Hill. David C. Norton, District Judge. (0:16-cv-03190-DCN)		
Submitted: March 30, 2017	Decided: April 4, 2017	
Before TRAXLER and WYNN, Ci	rcuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.	
Dismissed by unpublished per curia	am opinion.	
Michael A. Dukes, Appellant Pro S	e.	
Unpublished opinions are not bindi	ng precedent in this circuit.	

PER CURIAM:

Michael A. Dukes seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition as unauthorized and successive. 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 Dukes 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