UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 21-6999

CHRISTOPHER PAUL MAHAFFEY,

       Petitioner - Appellant,

    v.

WARDEN, PERRY CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION,

       Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Anderson. Joseph Dawson, III, District Judge. (8:20-cv-01880-JD)

Submitted: March 29, 2022   Decided: May 24, 2022

Before AGEE, DIAZ, and QUATTLEBAUM, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Christopher Paul Mahaffey, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Christopher Paul Mahaffey seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on Mahaffey's 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition, and the court's order denying reconsideration. The orders are 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 the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists could find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong. *See Buck v. Davis*, 137 S. Ct. 759, 773-74 (2017). 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. *Gonzalez v. Thaler*, 565 U.S. 134, 140-41 (2012) (citing *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)).

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Mahaffey 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