

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
8

9 ADAM ANTHONY VASQUEZ,

No. C 08-268 SI (pr)

10 Petitioner,

**ORDER DENYING HABEAS
PETITION**

11 v.

12 B. CURRY, warden,

13 Respondent.
14 _____/

15 Petitioner filed a pro se petition for writ of habeas corpus directed to a denial of parole
16 by the Board of Parole Hearings. The court dismissed the petition with leave to amend.
17 Petitioner amended, and upon review of the amended petition, the court dismissed all claims
18 except his contention that the evidence was insufficient to support the parole denial. A new
19 decision from the U.S. Supreme Court requires that the petition be summarily denied.

20 A “federal court may issue a writ of habeas corpus to a state prisoner ‘only on the ground
21 that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States.’”
22 Swarthout v. Cooke, No. 10-333, slip op. 1, 4 (U.S. Jan. 24, 2011) (citations omitted.) The
23 court may not grant habeas relief for state law errors. Id.

24 For purposes of federal habeas review, a California prisoner is entitled to only “minimal”
25 procedural protections in connection with a parole suitability determination. The procedural
26 protections to which the prisoner is entitled under the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth
27 Amendment to the U.S. Constitution are limited to an opportunity to be heard and a statement
28 of the reasons why parole was denied. See id. at 4-5. The Court explained that no Supreme

1 Court case “supports converting California’s ‘some evidence’ rule into a substantive federal
2 requirement,” id. at 5, and the Ninth Circuit erred in holding otherwise.

3 In light of the Supreme Court’s determination that the constitutionally-mandated
4 procedural protections do not include a requirement that there be some evidence (or any other
5 amount of evidence) to support the parole denial, the petition for writ of habeas corpus is
6 DENIED.

7 A certificate of appealability will not issue because petitioner has not made "a substantial
8 showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). This is not a case in
9 which "reasonable jurists would find the district court’s assessment of the constitutional claims
10 debatable or wrong." Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000).

11 IT IS SO ORDERED.

12 DATED: January 28, 2011



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge

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