

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 22-7357

JAMES TYTIL WRIGHT,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN, BROAD RIVER CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Rock Hill. Richard Mark Gergel, District Judge. (0:22-cv-01102-RMG)

Submitted: May 18, 2023

Decided: May 23, 2023

Before NIEMEYER, RICHARDSON, and RUSHING, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

James Tytil Wright, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

James Tytil Wright seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing as untimely Wright's 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 Wright's informal brief, we conclude that Wright has not made the requisite showing. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b); *see also 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