

ON REHEARING

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 15-6485

PAUL ANTHONY RICE, a/k/a Paul Rice,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN JOHN PATE,

Respondent - Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of
South Carolina, at Florence. Mary G. Lewis, District Judge.
(4:14-cv-00185-MGL)

Submitted: December 30, 2015 Decided: January 5, 2016

Before DUNCAN, AGEE, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Paul Anthony Rice, Appellant Pro Se. Donald John Zelenka,
Senior Assistant Attorney General, Melody Jane Brown, Assistant
Attorney General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Paul Anthony Rice seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) 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) (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 Rice has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, deny Rice's motion for transcripts at government expense, 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