FILED

DEC 09 2013

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FRANCIS RAJ, Petitioner - Appellant, v. MICHAEL L. BENOV, Warden, Respondent - Appellee.	No. 11-17469 D.C. No. 1:11-cv-01165-LJO MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Lawrence J. O'Neill, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted November 19, 2013**

Before: CANBY, TROTT, and THOMAS, Circuit Judges.

Francis Raj appeals pro se from the district court's judgment denying his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition challenging a prison disciplinary action that resulted in the loss of good time credits. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

review the denial of a section 2241 petition de novo, *see Tablada v. Thomas*, 533 F.3d 800, 805 (9th Cir. 2008), and we affirm.

Raj was found to have violated the Bureau of Prisons' Prohibited Acts Code 104, based on his possession of a razor blade. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 541.13, Table 3, Code 104 (2010) (prohibiting "[p]ossession, manufacture, or introduction of a gun, firearm, weapon, sharpened instrument, knife, dangerous chemical, explosive or any ammunition"). Raj contends that this finding was not supported because a razor blade is not a "weapon" or "sharpened instrument." This contention is unavailing because a razor blade removed from a disposable razor is inherently dangerous. Accordingly, Raj's due process rights were not violated because some evidence supports the disciplinary findings. *See Superintendent v. Hill*, 472 U.S. 445, 455 (1985).

In his reply brief, Raj also contends that the disciplinary hearing officer at Taft Correctional Institution lacked authority to discipline him. Because this contention was not raised in Raj's petition before the district court, we decline to consider it on appeal. *See Cacoperdo v. Demosthenes*, 37 F.3d 504, 507 (9th Cir. 1994) ("Habeas claims that are not raised before the district court in the petition are not cognizable on appeal.").

AFFIRMED.