

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 13-6067

EARL WAYNE FLOWERS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

SID HARKLEROAD, Administrator of Marion Correctional
Institution,

Respondent- Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western
District of North Carolina, at Shelby. Robert J. Conrad, Jr.,
District Judge. (5:12-cv-00049-RJC)

Submitted: June 20, 2013

Decided: June 25, 2013

Before GREGORY, DUNCAN, and DAVIS, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Earl Wayne Flowers, Appellant Pro Se. Mary Carla Hollis,
Assistant Attorney General, Raleigh, North Carolina, for
Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Earl Wayne Flowers seeks to appeal the district court's orders dismissing as untimely his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition and denying reconsideration of that order. The orders are 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 Flowers 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 this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED