

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 16-7687

JOE LEE FULGHAM,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

JACK BARBER, M.D., Interim Commissioner of the Virginia
Department of Behavioral Health and Development Services,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Arenda L. Wright Allen,
District Judge. (2:16-cv-00001-AWA-DEM)

Submitted: February 16, 2017

Decided: February 22, 2017

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, DUNCAN, Circuit Judge, and
HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Joe Lee Fulgham, Appellant Pro Se. Susan Mozley Harris,
Assistant Attorney General, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Joe Lee Fulgham seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and 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. 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 Fulgham has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny Fulgham's motions for release and for oral presentation. 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