

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 25-6985**

---

JEFFREY MITCHELL,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

JOSEPH WALTERS, Director, Virginia Department of Corrections,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at  
Richmond. Roderick Charles Young, District Judge. (3:24-cv-00720-RCY-MRC)

---

Submitted: May 28, 2026

Decided: June 2, 2026

---

Before WYNN, QUATTLEBAUM, and HEYTENS, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jeffrey Mitchell, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Jeffrey Mitchell seeks to appeal the district court's order dismissing as untimely his 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)). Preliminarily, Mitchell has moved for an extension of time to file a motion for a certificate of appealability; we grant that motion. He has also moved for assignment of counsel; we deny that motion.

The district court's 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 Mitchell has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny Mitchell's motion for 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*