

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
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

LARRY L. TIONSON,
Petitioner,
v.
J. PRICE,
Respondent.

No. 2:16-cv-1749 CKD P

ORDER AND
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 together with a request to proceed in forma pauperis pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Examination of the request to proceed in forma pauperis reveals that petitioner is unable to afford the costs of suit. Accordingly, the request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis will be granted. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a).

Under Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, the court must review all petitions for writ of habeas corpus and summarily dismiss any petition if it is plain that the petitioner is not entitled to relief. The court has conducted that review.

Petitioner challenges the fact that he was denied parole in 2015. Petitioner has a liberty interest in parole protected by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. Swarthout v. Cooke, 562 U.S. 216, 219-20 (2011). However, the procedural protections which must be afforded with respect to the liberty interest implicated are minimal; the “Constitution does not

1 require more” than “an opportunity to be heard” at a parole hearing and that the potential parolee
2 be “provided a statement of the reasons why parole was denied.” Id. at 220. Essentially,
3 petitioner argues that the evidence presented at his parole hearing is insufficient to support a
4 denial of parole. However, petitioner has no federal rights concerning the sufficiency of evidence
5 presented at parole proceedings. While petitioner does have rights concerning the sufficiency of
6 evidence presented at parole proceedings which arise under California law, state law cannot
7 provide the basis for federal habeas relief. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a)

8 For these reasons, the court will recommend that petitioner’s petition for writ of habeas
9 corpus be summarily dismissed.

10 Accordingly, IT IS HERBY ORDERED that:

- 11 1. Petitioner’s request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 4) is granted; and
- 12 2. The Clerk of the Court is directed to assign a district court judge to this case.

13 IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED that:

- 14 1. Petitioner’s petition for writ of habeas corpus be summarily dismissed; and
- 15 2. This case be closed.

16 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge
17 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days
18 after being served with these findings and recommendations, petitioner may file written
19 objections with the court. Such a document should be captioned “Objections to Magistrate
20 Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” In his objections petitioner may address whether a
21 certificate of appealability should issue in the event he files an appeal of the judgment in this
22 case. See Rule 11, Federal Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases (the district court must issue or
23 deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant). Petitioner

24 /////

25 /////

26 /////

27 /////

28 /////

1 is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the
2 District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

3 Dated: August 29, 2016



CAROLYN K. DELANEY
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

4
5
6
7
8 1
9 tion1749.nop

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28