**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

_____

**No. 22-6147**

_____

GRAHAM HARRY SCHIFF,

          Petitioner - Appellant,

    v.

MARYLAND ATTORNEY GENERAL,

          Respondent - Appellee.

_____

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of Maryland, at Baltimore. Deborah Lynn Boardman, District Judge.  (1:21-cv-02448-DLB)

_____

Submitted:  May 24, 2022                         Decided:  May 27, 2022

_____

Before NIEMEYER, KING, and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges.

_____

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

_____

Graham Harry Schiff, Appellant Pro Se.

_____

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Graham Harry Schiff seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition for failure to exhaust state court remedies. 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 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 Schiff has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny Schiff's motions for a stay pending appeal and to expedite. 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*