UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

-		
<u>-</u>	No. 17-7398	
LEANTHONY WINSTON,		
Petitioner - Ap	ppellant,	
v.		
HAROLD W. CLARKE, Director	of the Virginia Depa	rtment of Corrections,
Respondent - A	Appellee.	
-		
Appeal from the United States D. Norfolk. Robert G. Doumar, Senio		
Submitted: January 30, 2018		Decided: February 2, 2018
Before MOTZ and KEENAN, Circ	uit Judges, and HAN	MILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.
Dismissed by unpublished per curia	am opinion.	
LeAnthony Winston, Appellant Pro	Se.	
Unpublished opinions are not bindi	ng precedent in this	circuit.

PER CURIAM:

LeAnthony Winston seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing without prejudice his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition for failure to exhaust state court remedies. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. *See* 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 reviewed the record and Winton's informal brief and conclude that Winston has failed to challenge on appeal the district court's dispositive procedural ruling. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). 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