

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 19-6357

NATHANIEL MURRAY,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN STEPHAN,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Rock Hill. Terry L. Wooten, Senior District Judge. (0:18-cv-00960-TLW)

Submitted: June 20, 2019

Decided: June 25, 2019

Before NIEMEYER, AGEE, and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Nathaniel Murray, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Nathaniel Murray 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.

Based on the arguments presented in his informal brief, see 4th Cir. R. 34(b), and his failure to object to the magistrate judge's recommendation on one ground after receiving proper notice, see *Martin v. Duffy*, 858 F.3d 239, 245 (4th Cir. 2017), we conclude that Murray 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