UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

_	No. 20-7027	
ANTWINE JERMAINE REID,		
Petitioner - Ap	ppellant,	
v.		
D. L. MILLER, SR., Warden,		
Respondent - A	Appellee.	
Appeal from the United States D Alexandria. Leonie M. Brinkema,		
Submitted: October 28, 2020		Decided: November 17, 2020
Before FLOYD, THACKER, and F	RICHARDSON, Circ	cuit Judges.
Dismissed by unpublished per curia	am opinion.	
Antwine Jermaine Reid, Appellant	Pro Se.	
Unpublished opinions are not bindi	ng precedent in this	circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Antwine Jermaine Reid seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as untimely his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition. *See Gonzalez v. Thaler*, 565 U.S. 134, 148 & n.9 (2012) (explaining that § 2254 petitions are subject to one-year statute of limitations, running from latest of four commencement dates enumerated in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1)). The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A). 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). When, as here, 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. *Gonzalez*, 565 U.S. at 140-41 (citing *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)).

Limiting our review of the record to the issues raised in Reid's informal brief, we conclude that Reid has not made the requisite showing. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b); *see Jackson v. Lightsey*, 775 F.3d 170, 177 (4th Cir. 2014) ("The informal brief is an important document; under Fourth Circuit rules, our review is limited to issues preserved in that brief."). Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny Reid's motion to appoint counsel, 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