

APR 18 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>ROGER BETTENCOURT,</p> <p>Petitioner - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>MIKE KNOWLES, Warden; ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,</p> <p>Respondents - Appellees.</p>
--

No. 10-15678

D.C. No. 2:07-cv-02246-FCD

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Frank C. Damrell, Jr., District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 17, 2012**

Before: LEAVY, PAEZ, and BEA, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Roger Bettencourt appeals pro se from the district court's judgment denying his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas petition. We have

* 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).

jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2253, and we affirm.

Bettencourt contends that the Board of Parole Hearings's 2005 decision finding him unsuitable for parole was not supported by "some evidence" and, therefore, violated his due process rights. The only federal right at issue in the parole context is procedural, and the only proper inquiry is what process the inmate received, not whether the state court decided the case correctly. *See Swarthout v. Cooke*, 131 S. Ct. 859, 862-63 (2011) (per curiam). Because Bettencourt raises no procedural challenges, we affirm.

AFFIRMED.