

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 17-6092**

---

RONNIE PERRY,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

FRANK L. PERRY,

Respondent - Appellee,

and

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY,

Respondent.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina, at Raleigh. James C. Dever, III, Chief District Judge. (5:15-hc-02251-D)

---

Submitted: May 25, 2017

---

Decided: May 31, 2017

---

Before MOTZ, THACKER, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Ronnie Perry, Appellant Pro Se. Jess D. Mekeel, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Ronnie Perry seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as untimely 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 Perry has not made the requisite showing. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1)(D) (2012), the one-year statute of limitations began to run on February 20, 2012, when the factual predicate for Perry's claim could have been discovered through due diligence. Perry did not file his § 2254 petition until October 2015, more than two years after the limitations period expired, and his intervening petitions did not toll the limitations period. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, 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*