

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 03-6153**

---

RICHARD HORTON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

versus

DOUG MITCHELL, Superintendent,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western District of North Carolina, at Statesville. Graham C. Mullen, Chief District Judge. (CA-02-127-5-1MU)

---

Submitted: April 17, 2003

Decided: April 23, 2003

---

Before WIDENER, WILLIAMS, and MOTZ, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Richard Horton, Appellant Pro Se. Clarence Joe DelForge, III, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF NORTH CAROLINA, Raleigh, North Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Richard Horton seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2000) petition. An appeal may not be taken to this Court from the final order in a habeas corpus proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c) (2000). When, as here, a district court dismisses a habeas petition on procedural grounds, a certificate of appealability will not issue unless the petitioner can demonstrate both "(1) 'that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petition states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right' and (2) 'that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural ruling.'" Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 684 (4th Cir.) (quoting Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)), cert. denied, 534 U.S. 941 (2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Horton has not made the requisite showing. Miller-El v. Cockrell, \_\_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_\_, 123 S. Ct. 1029 (2003). 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 the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED