

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

9 JACKIE OSBY,

No. C 10-1691 SI (pr)

10 Petitioner,

**ORDER DENYING HABEAS
PETITION**

11 v.

12 C. NOLL, warden,

13 Respondent.
14 _____/

15
16 Jackie Osby filed a pro se petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254
17 in which he claimed that a decision by the Board of Parole Hearings to find him not suitable for
18 parole violated his right to due process because it was not supported by sufficient evidence. A
19 new 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
Court case “supports converting California’s ‘some evidence’ rule into a substantive federal


1 requirement," id. at 5, and the Ninth Circuit erred in holding otherwise.

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

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

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 DATED: January 25, 2011



SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge

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