1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	
11	KENNETH MCCURDY, No. C 07-5084 CW (PR)
12	Petitioner,
13	v. ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS; DENYING
14	BEN CURRY, Warden, CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY
15	Respondent.
16	/
17	
18	<u>Pro</u> <u>se</u> Petitioner Kenneth McCurdy seeks a writ of habeas corpus
19	under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 challenging the September 7, 2006 decision of
20	the California Board of Parole Hearings (BPH) denying him parole at

26 Doc. No. 1-2 at 7; Doc. No. 27.

his eighth parole suitability hearing.

The United States Supreme Court recently made clear that in the context of a federal habeas challenge to the denial of parole, a

due process in denying him a parole date by using the "unchanging

information and overlooking current reports submitted by Petitioner.

factors" of his commitment offense, continuing to use outdated

Specifically, Petitioner claims that the BPH denied him

United States District Court For the Northern District of California

21

22

23

24

25

18-3 at 44.

Doc. No. 1-1 at 7; Doc. No.

1 prisoner subject to a parole statute similar to California's 2 receives adequate process when the BPH allows him an opportunity to 3 be heard and provides him with a statement of the reasons why parole 4 was denied. <u>Swarthout v. Cooke</u>, No. 10-333, slip op. at 4-5 (U.S. 5 Jan. 24, 2011). Here, the record shows Petitioner received at least 6 this amount of process. The Constitution does not require more. 7 <u>Id.</u> at 5.

8 The Court also made clear that whether the BPH's decision was 9 supported by some evidence of current dangerousness is irrelevant in 10 federal habeas: "it is no federal concern . . . whether 11 California's 'some evidence' rule of judicial review (a procedure 12 beyond what the Constitution demands) was correctly applied." 13 <u>Swarthout v. Cooke</u>, slip op. at 6.

Accordingly, the instant federal Petition for a Writ of Habeascorpus is DENIED.

16 Further, a Certificate of Appealability is DENIED. See Rule 17 11(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. Petitioner has not 18 made "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional 19 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). Nor has Petitioner demonstrated right." 20 that "reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment 21 of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong." <u>Slack v.</u> 22 McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). Petitioner may not appeal the 23 denial of a Certificate of Appealability in this Court but may seek 24 a certificate from the Court of Appeals under Rule 22 of the Federal 25 Rules of Appellate Procedure. See Rule 11(a) of the Rules Governing 26 Section 2254 Cases.

27

28

1	The Clerk shall terminate any pending motions as moot, enter
2	judgment in favor of Respondent and close the file.
3	
4	IT IS SO ORDERED.
5	
6	Dated: 2/7/2011 CLAUDIA WILKEN
7	United States District Judge
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	3

1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
2 3	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
4	KENNETH DONALD MCCURDY, Case Number: CV07-05084 CW
5	Plaintiff, CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
6	v.
7	BEN CURRY et al,
8	/ Defendant.
9 10	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.
11 12	That on February 7, 2011, I SERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the attached, by placing said copy(ies) in a postage paid envelope addressed to the person(s) hereinafter listed, by depositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office delivery receptacle located
13	in the Clerk's office.
14	
15	Kenneth Donald McCurdy C-76230 H-342-L
16	P.O. Box 2000 Vacaville, CA 95696-2000
17	Dated: February 7, 2011
18	Richard W. Wieking, Clerk By: Nikki Riley, Deputy Clerk
19	
20	
21	
22 23	
23 24	
25	
26	
27	
28	4