## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT M. KURTZ,

v.

No. C 11-00126 CW (PR)

Petitioner,

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS; DENYING CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY

R. GROUNDS, Warden, et al.,

Respondents.

Petitioner seeks a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 challenging as a violation of his constitutional rights the 2009 decision to deny him parole by the California Board of Parole Hearings (Board). Petitioner specifically claims that the decision does not comport with due process because it is not supported by some evidence demonstrating that he poses a current unreasonable threat to the public. He also claims that conducting his parole hearing under Proposition 9 (Marsy's Law) was a violation of the ex post facto clause of federal constitution. Proposition 9, the "Victims' Bill of Rights Act of 2008: Marsy's Law," modified the availability and frequency of parole hearings. Specifically, Marsy's Law provides that the Board will hear each case every fifteen years unless it opts to schedule the next hearing in three, five, seven or ten years. Cal. Penal Code § 3041.5(b)(3) (2010).

In the context of parole, a prisoner subject to a parole statute similar to California's receives adequate process when he is allowed an opportunity to be heard and is provided with a statement of the reasons why parole was denied. <u>Swarthout v.</u> <u>Cooke</u>, No. 10-333, slip op. at 4-5 (U.S. Jan. 24, 2011). The attachments to the petition show Petitioner received at least this

amount of process. The Constitution does not require more. <u>Id.</u> at

Whether the Board's decision was supported by some evidence of current dangerousness is irrelevant on a petition for a writ of habeas corpus in federal court. The Supreme Court has made clear that "it is no federal concern . . . whether California's 'some evidence' rule of judicial review (a procedure beyond what the Constitution demands) was correctly applied." Id. at 6.

Petitioner's ex post facto claim also fails. The Ninth Circuit has recently held that Marsy's Law does not violate the ex post facto clause. See Gillman v. Schwarzenegger, No. 10-15471, slip op. 1339, 1357 (9th Cir., Jan. 24, 2011). Accordingly, the Court finds that Petitioner's allegations do not state a cognizable claim for an ex post facto violation.

For the foregoing reasons, the petition for a writ of habeas corpus is DENIED. And pursuant to Rule 11 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, a certificate of appealability under 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c) is DENIED because it cannot be said that "reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong." Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). Petitioner may seek a certificate of appealability from the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.

The Clerk of the Court shall enter judgment in favor of Respondent, terminate all pending motions, and close the file.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

26 Dated: 2/15/2011

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
3	ROBERT M. KURTZ,
4	Case Number: CV11-00126 CW Plaintiff,
5	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE v.
6	R. GROUNDS et al,
7	Defendant.
8	
9	I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District
10	Court, Northern District of California.
11	That on February 15, 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
12	epositing said envelope in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into an inter-office elivery receptacle located in the Clerk's office.
13	
14	
15	Robert M. Kurtz H94447 Correctional Training Facility
16	P.O. Box 689 Soledad, CA 93960-0689
17	Dated: February 15, 2011
18	Richard W. Wieking, Clerk By: Nikki Riley, Deputy Clerk
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	