

UNPUBLISHEDUNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 23-7099

RICHARD WADE KENDRICK,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

CHADWICK DOTSON, Director of the Virginia Department of Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia, at
Roanoke. James P. Jones, Senior District Judge. (7:22-cv-00454-JPJ-PMS)

Submitted: December 5, 2024

Decided: December 9, 2024

Before GREGORY and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges, and FLOYD, Senior Circuit
Judge.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Richard Wade Kendrick, Appellant Pro Se.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Richard Wade Kendrick seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as untimely his 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 Kendrick's informal brief, we conclude that Kendrick 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 deny Kendrick's motion for 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