

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-6426

CLARENCE SCOTT MILLER,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

MR. WILLIE EAGLETON,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. Timothy M. Cain, District Judge. (6:15-cv-03726-TMC)

Submitted: September 29, 2017

Decided: October 17, 2017

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and SHEDD and DIAZ, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Clarence Scott Miller, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Clarence Scott Miller 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 Miller 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

* Construing Miller's informal and supplemental briefs liberally, see *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (per curiam), we conclude that Miller only challenged the district court's denial of his motions for discovery and an extension of time.

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

DISMISSED