

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-6708**

---

BRUCE B. THOMAS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN STEVENSON,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Beaufort. R. Bryan Harwell, District Judge. (9:12-cv-01113-RBH)

---

Submitted: September 16, 2013                      Decided: September 24, 2013

---

Before GREGORY, SHEDD, and KEENAN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Bruce B. Thomas, Appellant Pro Se. William Edgar Salter, III, Assistant Attorney General, Donald John Zelenka, Senior Assistant Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Bruce B. Thomas seeks to appeal the district court's orders accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2006) petition and denying Thomas' motion for reconsideration. 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 Thomas has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis and 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