

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-6853

ROBERT DARNELL ROBERTS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

SOLOMON HEJIRIKA, Sr.; THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF
MARYLAND,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
Maryland, at Greenbelt. Alexander Williams, Jr., District
Judge. (8:11-cv-00868-AW)

Submitted: September 24, 2013

Decided: September 27, 2013

Before NIEMEYER and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON,
Senior Circuit Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Robert Roberts, Appellant Pro Se. Edward John Kelley, OFFICE OF
THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF MARYLAND, Baltimore, Maryland, for
Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Robert Darnell Roberts seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition and has filed motions for appointment of counsel. The district court's order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2006). 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) (2006). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). 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. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85.

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Roberts has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Roberts' motions for appointment of counsel, 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