

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 17-6571**

---

JOHN DOUGLAS ALEXANDER,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

LEROY CARTLEDGE, Warden,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., Senior District Judge. (6:16-cv-00600-HMH)

---

Submitted: September 28, 2017

Decided: October 17, 2017

---

Before AGEE, KEENAN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

John Douglas Alexander, Appellant Pro Se. Susannah Rawl Cole, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA, Donald John Zelenka, Deputy Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

John Douglas Alexander seeks to appeal the district court's orders accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition and denying his motion for reconsideration. The orders are 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 Alexander has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Alexander's motions for a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We further deny Alexander's motion for appointment of counsel. 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*