

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MAR 25 2021

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

CHRISTOPHER LAWRENCE JEBURK,

No. 20-55299

Petitioner-Appellant,

D.C. No. 2:19-cv-09321-ODW-
DFM

v.

LOUIS MILUSNIC,

MEMORANDUM*

Respondent-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Otis D. Wright II, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted March 16, 2021**

Before: GRABER, R. NELSON, and HUNSAKER, Circuit Judges.

Federal prisoner Christopher Lawrence Jeburk appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas corpus petition.

We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo, *see Thomas v.*

Brewer, 923 F.2d 1361, 1364 (9th Cir. 1991), and we affirm.

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

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

In his § 2241 petition, Jeburk asked the district court to expunge a disciplinary infraction from his prison record. Jeburk claimed that the disciplinary proceeding violated his due process rights, and that the infraction was used as a ground to transfer him to a higher security prison. Jeburk previously raised similar arguments in a § 2241 habeas petition and in a motion for a preliminary injunction, which the district court dismissed.

Here, the district court properly concluded that Jeburk's instant § 2241 petition did not demonstrate that a due process violation occurred or that Jeburk was entitled to relief. *See Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. 539, 563-68, 570-71 (1974); *see also Liteky v. United States*, 510 U.S. 540, 555 (1994) (unfavorable or adverse rulings alone are insufficient to show bias unless they reflect such extreme favoritism or antagonism that the exercise of fair judgment is precluded).

AFFIRMED.