

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 20-7690

ANTOINE MARTWAIN HILL-EL, a/k/a Antoine Martwain Hill, a/k/a Antoine M. Hill,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

CALVIN JOHNSON,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Greenbelt. Theodore D. Chuang, District Judge. (8:18-cv-01654-TDC)

Submitted: March 23, 2021

Decided: March 29, 2021

Before THACKER, QUATTLEBAUM, and RUSHING, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Antoine Martwain Hill-El, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Antoine Martwain Hill-El 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. *See* 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)).

On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the informal brief. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Hill-El's informal brief does not challenge the dispositive timeliness determination by the district court, he has forfeited appellate review. *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 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