

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 18-6406**

---

WILLIAM TRAMPAS WIDMYER,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN DAVID BALLARD,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Northern District of West Virginia,  
at Clarksburg. Irene M. Keeley, Senior District Judge. (1:10-cv-00084-IMK)

---

Submitted: January 31, 2019

Decided: March 12, 2019

---

Before WYNN and DIAZ, Circuit Judges, and SHEDD, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

William Trampas Widmyer, Appellant Pro Se. Lindsay Sara See, OFFICE OF THE  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF WEST VIRGINIA, Charleston, West Virginia, for  
Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William Trampas Widmyer 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 Widmyer has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny leave to proceed in forma pauperis, 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*