UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

·		
<u>.</u>	No. 18-6104	
EARNEST BRADLEY HALL,		
Petitioner - Ap	opellant,	
v.		
WARDEN, USP MARION,		
Respondent - A	Appellee.	
Appeal from the United States D Roanoke. Michael F. Urbanski, Ch		9 ,
Submitted: June 21, 2018		Decided: June 26, 2018
Before DIAZ and HARRIS, Circui	t Judges, and SHED	D, Senior Circuit Judge.
Dismissed by unpublished per curia	am opinion.	
Earnest Bradley Hall, Appellant Pr	o Se.	
Unpublished opinions are not bindi	ing precedent in this	circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Earnest Bradley Hall seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as time-barred his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. 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 Hall has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, 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