

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 17-7634

KEITH D. GOODMAN,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

I. D. HAMILTON, Warden, Haynesville Corr. Center,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Claude M. Hilton, Senior District Judge. (1:17-cv-00279-CMH-TCB)

Submitted: April 19, 2018

Decided: April 23, 2018

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, and THACKER and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Keith D. Goodman, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Keith D. Goodman seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing as successive his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition and denying his subsequent Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion to alter or amend judgment. 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 Goodman 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