

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

No. 19-7333

ARIMATIA ARPAD BUGGS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA; WARDEN TYGER RIVER CORRECTIONAL
INSTITUTION,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at
Anderson. Henry M. Herlong, Jr., Senior District Judge. (8:19-cv-01872-HMH)

Submitted: December 19, 2019

Decided: December 23, 2019

Before NIEMEYER, AGEE, and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Arimatia Arpad Buggs, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Arimatia Arpad Buggs seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing Buggs' 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition as untimely. 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 Buggs 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