

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 16-6791**

---

KASHEEM NUNNALLY,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

HAROLD CLARKE, Director,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Richmond. Roderick Charles Young, Magistrate Judge. (3:15-cv-00327-RCY)

---

Submitted: November 22, 2016                      Decided: November 29, 2016

---

Before DIAZ and THACKER, Circuit Judges, and DAVIS, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Kasheem Nunnally, Appellant Pro Se. Aaron Jennings Campbell, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF VIRGINIA, Richmond, Virginia, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Kasheem Nunnally seeks to appeal the magistrate judge's order\* dismissing as untimely 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 Nunnally 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

---

\* The parties consented to the jurisdiction of the magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) (2012).

because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED