UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 18-6405

TAVON HILTON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Mark S. Davis, District Judge. (2:18-cv-00093-MSD-RJK)

Submitted: August 7, 2018

Decided: August 16, 2018

Before GREGORY, Chief Judge, MOTZ, Circuit Judge, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Tavon Hilton, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Tavon Hilton seeks to appeal the district court's order adopting in part the recommendation of the magistrate judge and 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); *Jones v. Braxton*, 392 F.3d 683, 688 (4th Cir. 2004). 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 Hilton 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

2