## **UNPUBLISHED**

## UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

•	
	No. 18-7112
TUNZY A. SANDERS,	
Petitioner - Ap	opellant,
v.	
WARDEN OF ALLENDALE COI	RRECTIONAL INSTITUTION,
Respondent -	Appellee.
1.1	District Court for the District of South Carolina, at , Senior District Judge. (2:17-cv-01819-HMH)
Submitted: February 26, 2019	Decided: March 1, 2019
Before KING, THACKER, and QU	JATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges.
Dismissed by unpublished per curi	am opinion.
	Se. Melody Jane Brown, Senior Assistant Attorney TTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA, pellee.
Unpublished opinions are not bind	ing precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Tunzy A. Sanders seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as untimely 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 Sanders has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we 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**