

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 12-7823**

---

TROY LAMONT KETCHMORE,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

HAROLD W. CLARKE, Director of the Virginia Department of  
Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Norfolk. Rebecca Beach Smith, Chief  
District Judge. (2:12-cv-00515-RBS-DEM)

---

Submitted: January 22, 2013

Decided: January 25, 2013

---

Before WILKINSON, NIEMEYER, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Troy Lamont Ketchmore, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Troy Lamont Ketchmore seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition as an unauthorized, successive 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.

On appeal, we confine our review to the issues raised in the Appellant's brief. See 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Because Ketchmore does not challenge the basis for the district court's disposition, he has forfeited appellate review of the court's order. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability,

deny as moot the motions for bail pending appeal, 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