

APR 22 2013

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

|  |
|--|
| <p>JON RANDALL CRAWLEY,</p> <p>Petitioner - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>M. KRAMER, Warden, and ATTORNEY<br/>GENERAL FOR THE STATE OF<br/>CALIFORNIA,</p> <p>Respondents - Appellees.</p> |
|--|

No. 10-16574

D.C. No. 2:07-cv-01288-RSL

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
Robert S. Lasnik, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 16, 2013\*\*

Before: CANBY, IKUTA, and WATFORD, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Jon Randall Crawley 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. We review de novo a district court's decision to deny a habeas petition, *see Lambert v. Blodgett*, 393 F.3d 943, 964 (9th Cir. 2004), and we affirm.

Crawley contends that the Board of Parole Hearings's 2006 decision to deny him parole was not supported by "some evidence" and therefore violated his due process rights. He also challenges the validity of the "some evidence" standard. 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, 863 (2011) (per curiam). Because Crawley raises no procedural challenges, we affirm.

**AFFIRMED.**