UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

| • | | |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------------|
| | No. 17-7131 | |
| CLARK R. MCKNIGHT, | | |
| Petitioner - A _l | ppellant, | |
| v. | | |
| WARDEN FRANK BISHOP; THI MARYLAND, | E ATTORNEY GEN | ERAL OF THE STATE OF |
| Respondents - | Appellees. | |
| Appeal from the United States Dis J. Frederick Motz, Senior District J | | 11-JFM) |
| Submitted: December 19, 2017 | | Decided: December 22, 2017 |
| Before SHEDD, AGEE, and DIAZ | Z, Circuit Judges. | |
| Dismissed by unpublished per curi | am opinion. | |
| Clark R. McKnight, Appellant ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MAI | | · · |
| Unpublished opinions are not bind | ing precedent in this | circuit. |

PER CURIAM:

Clark R. McKnight seeks to appeal the district court's order 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 McKnight has not made the requisite showing. 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