

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 17-7050**

---

COREY JAWAN ROBINSON,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

JOSEPH MCFADDEN, Warden,

Respondent - Appellee.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Orangeburg. J. Michelle Childs, District Judge. (5:14-cv-04718-JMC)

---

Submitted: January 30, 2018

Decided: February 1, 2018

---

Before MOTZ and KEENAN, Circuit Judges, and HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Corey Jawan Robinson, Appellant Pro Se. Donald John Zelenka, Deputy Attorney General, William Edgar Salter, III, Assistant Attorney General, OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF SOUTH CAROLINA, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

## PER CURIAM:

Corey Jawan Robinson seeks to appeal the district court's orders accepting in part the first recommendation of the magistrate judge and accepting the second recommendation of the magistrate judge and denying relief on his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 (2012) petition. The orders are 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 Robinson has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny as moot Robinson's motion to stay the appeal pending resolution of his Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e) motion, deny his 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*