

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 12-6199

SAMUEL HARRIS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

PATRICIA STANSBERRY, Warden; ISAAC FULWOOD, Chairman United
States Parole Commission,

Respondents - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern
District of Virginia, at Alexandria. James C. Cacheris, Senior
District Judge. (1:10-cv-01337-JCC-TRJ)

Submitted: May 18, 2012

Decided: May 25, 2012

Before AGEE, DAVIS, and FLOYD, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Samuel Harris, Appellant Pro Se. Yiris E. Cornwall, Assistant
United States Attorney, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Samuel Harris, a District of Columbia Code offender, seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his 28 U.S.C.A. § 2241 (West 2006 & Supp. 2011) petition. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 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 Harris has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, 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