Doc. 406627166

Filed: 08/01/2017 Pg: 1 of 3

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS	S
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT	

No. 17-6694
DAVID KENNETH FOWLER,
Petitioner - Appellant,
v.
FRANK L. PERRY, substituted for State of North Carolina,
Respondent - Appellee,
and
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
Respondent.
Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Asheville. Frank D. Whitney, Chief District Judge. (1:16-cv-00302-FDW)
Submitted: July 27, 2017 Decided: August 1, 2017
Before AGEE and FLOYD, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.
Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.
David Kenneth Fowler, Appellant Pro Se. Clarence Joe DelForge, III, NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

Appeal: 17-6694 Doc: 5 Filed: 08/01/2017 Pg: 2 of 3

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

David Kenneth Fowler 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 Fowler 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