

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 22-6330**

---

WILLIAM JOE PHILLIPS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

WARDEN OF PERRY CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTION,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Greenville. Mary G. Lewis, District Judge. (6:19-cv-02156-MGL)

---

Submitted: November 22, 2022

Decided: November 28, 2022

---

Before HARRIS and RICHARDSON, Circuit Judges, and TRAXLER, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

William Joe Phillips, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

William Joe Phillips seeks to appeal the district court's order accepting the recommendation of the magistrate judge and dismissing as untimely Phillips' 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition. *See Gonzalez v. Thaler*, 565 U.S. 134, 148 & n.9 (2012) (explaining that § 2254 petitions are subject to one-year statute of limitations, running from latest of four commencement dates enumerated in 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1)). The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(A). 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). When, as here, 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. *Gonzalez*, 565 U.S. at 140-41 (citing *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000)).

We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Phillips has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability, deny Phillips' motions to appoint counsel and for abeyance, 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*