

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 23-7082**

---

MARKELYN LAMONTRE JONES,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

CHADWICK DOTSON, Director, Virginia Department of Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Arenda L. Wright Allen, District Judge. (2:22-cv-00251-AWA-LRL)

---

Submitted: March 28, 2024

Decided: April 2, 2024

---

Before KING and RUSHING, Circuit Judges, and MOTZ, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Matthew McGavock Robinson, ROBINSON & BRANDT, PSC, Covington, Kentucky, for Appellant. Lauren Catherine Campbell, Assistant Attorney General, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Markelyn Lamontre Jones seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing as untimely Jones' 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)).

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Jones 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*