Rashawn Simmons v. Commonwealth of Virginia Appeal: 17-7593 Doc: 14 Filed: 03/22/2018 Pg: 1 of 2

Doc. 406913916

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS	S
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT	

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT	
No. 17-7593	
RASHAWN D. SIMMONS,	
Petitioner - Appellant,	
v.	
COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA; HAROLD W. CLARKE, Dir. of VA D.D.L.,	
Respondents - Appellees.	
Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, Alexandria. Liam O'Grady, District Judge. (1:17-cv-00957-LO-IDD)	at
Submitted: March 20, 2018 Decided: March 22, 20)18
Before DUNCAN and FLOYD, Circuit Judges, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.	
Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.	
Rashawn Simmons, Appellant Pro Se.	
Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.	

PER CURIAM:

Rashawn Simmons seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition as successive. 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 independently reviewed the record and conclude that Simmons has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny his motion for 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