

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ANDRE HALL,

Petitioner,

No. CIV S-09-3216 JAM CHS P

vs.

GARY SWARTHOUT, Warden,

Respondent.

ORDER VACATING FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

\_\_\_\_\_/

Petitioner Hall is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner challenges a November 20, 2008 decision of the state parole authority that he was not suitable for parole. On October 4, 2010, findings and recommendations issued herein, recommending that the petition be denied because the parole authority’s decision was supported by some evidence in the record.

Previously, the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit had directed “courts in this circuit [to] decide whether the California judicial decision approving the governor’s decision rejecting parole was an ‘unreasonable application’ of the California ‘some evidence’ requirement, or was ‘based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence.’” *Hayward v. Marshall*, 603 F.3d 546, 562-63 (9th Cir. 2010) (citations omitted).

1 Subsequent to the filing of the pending findings and recommendations, however, the United  
2 States Supreme Court held in *Swarthout v. Cooke*, No. 10-333, slip op. at 4-5 (U.S. January 24,  
3 2011), that a federal court's inquiry into whether an inmate in California received due process in  
4 the parole suitability hearing context does not include review of California's "some evidence"  
5 requirement. Rather, in the parole suitability context, "the only federal right at issue is  
6 procedural." *Id.* at 6. Thus, this court may only review a parole board's procedures to see that an  
7 inmate received an opportunity to be heard and a decision informing him of the reasons he did  
8 not qualify for parole. *See Swarthout*, slip op. at 4-5 (citing *Greenholtz*, 442 U.S. at 16).

9 In light of this new controlling Supreme Court authority, IT IS HEREBY  
10 ORDERED THAT the findings and recommendations signed on October 1, 2010 and filed on  
11 October 4, 2010, are VACATED. New findings and recommendations will issue.

12 DATED: January 27, 2011

13   
14 CHARLENE H. SORRENTINO  
15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26