

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 18-6334**

---

ROBERT JOE MCNEMAR,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

RALPH TERRY, Acting Warden, Mount Olive Correctional Complex,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia,  
at Elkins. John Preston Bailey, District Judge. (2:16-cv-00108-JPB)

---

Submitted: July 31, 2018

Decided: August 17, 2018

---

Before MOTZ, WYNN, and HARRIS, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Robert Joe McNemar, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Robert Joe McNemar seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and 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 McNemar has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, although we grant McNemar's motion for leave to file supplemental argument, we deny his motions for a certificate of appealability and for 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*