

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 13-7747**

---

JAMES FERLON CLARK,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

DIRECTOR OF THE DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western  
District of Virginia, at Roanoke. Glen E. Conrad, Chief  
District Judge. (7:13-cv-00450-GEC-RSB)

---

Submitted: March 27, 2014

Decided: March 31, 2014

---

Before MOTZ, Circuit Judge, and HAMILTON and DAVIS, Senior  
Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

James Ferlon Clark, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

James Ferlon Clark seeks to appeal the district court's order denying his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition as successive. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A) (2012). 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) (2012). 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 Clark has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Clark's motion for 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