

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-6331**

---

ANTHONY GLENN JAMES,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

LEROY CARTLEDGE,

Respondent - Appellee,

and

DIRECTOR OF SCDC,

Respondent.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of  
South Carolina, at Aiken. Timothy M. Cain, District Judge.  
(1:15-cv-03112-TMC)

---

Submitted: June 23, 2016

Decided: June 29, 2016

---

Before MOTZ, KING, and WYNN, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Anthony James, Appellant Pro Se. Caroline M. Scrantom, OFFICE  
OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA, Columbia, South  
Carolina, Donald John Zelenka, Senior Assistant Attorney  
General, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Anthony Glenn James seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing as untimely James' 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 James has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability 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