## **UNPUBLISHED**

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

•			
	No. 18-7004		
MILTON BROWN, a/k/a Sultan II	nmanuel El-Bey,		
Petitioner - Ap	ppellant,		
v.			
HAROLD W. CLARKE,			
Respondent -	Appellee.		
Appeal from the United States I Richmond. John A. Gibney, Jr., D Submitted: October 23, 2018  Before NIEMEYER, KING, and W Dismissed by unpublished per curi Milton Brown, Appellant Pro Se.	VYNN, Circuit Judges.	00418-JAG-R	•

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Milton Brown seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing without prejudice for failure to exhaust state court remedies 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 Brown 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**