

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

NOT FOR CITATION  
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT KASER,	)	No. C 05-02458 JF (PR)
	)	
Petitioner,	)	ORDER DENYING CERTIFICATE OF
	)	APPEALABILITY
vs.	)	
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	
_____	)	

Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding *pro se*, filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, challenging the California Board of Prison Terms’ decision denying parole. On March 6, 2008, the Court denied the instant petition on the merits and entered judgment in favor of Respondent. Petitioner filed a notice of appeal and the matter was forwarded to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit.

On July 15, 2010, the Ninth Circuit remanded this case for the limited purpose of granting or denying a certificate of appealability. *See Hayward v. Marshall*, No. 06-55392, 2010 WL 1664977, at \*5 (9th Cir. Apr. 22, 2010) (en banc) (overruling those portions of *White v. Lambert*, 370 F.3d 1002, 1004 (9th Cir. 2004), and *Rosas v. Nielsen*, 428 F.3d 1229, 1231-32 (9th Cir. 2005) (per curiam), that relieved a prisoner from obtaining a certificate of appealability to review the denial of a habeas petition

1 challenging an administrative decision denying parole).

2 “Where a district court has rejected the constitutional claims on the merits, the  
3 showing required to satisfy § 2253(c) is straightforward: the petitioner must demonstrate  
4 that reasonable jurists would find the district court’s assessment of the constitutional  
5 claims debatable or wrong.” Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). The Court  
6 denied the instant habeas petition after careful consideration of the merits. The Court  
7 found no violation of Petitioner’s federal constitutional rights in the administrative  
8 decision denying parole. Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that jurists of reason would  
9 find it debatable whether this Court was correct in its ruling. Accordingly, a certificate of  
10 appealability is DENIED.

11 The clerk shall close the case and forward this order to the Ninth Circuit from  
12 which Petitioner may also seek a certificate of appealability. See United States v. Asrar,  
13 116 F.3d 1268, 1270 (9th Cir. 1997).

14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15 DATED: 7/19/10

16   
17 \_\_\_\_\_  
18 JEREMY FOGEL  
19 United States District Judge  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROBERT KASER,

Petitioner,

v.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al.,

Respondent.

---

Case Number: CV05-02458 JF

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Northern District of California.

That on 7/26/10, 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 in the Clerk's office.

Robert P. Kaser D-41415  
San Quentin State Prison  
San Quentin, CA 94974

Dated: 7/26/10

Richard W. Wieking, Clerk