1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 NOT FOR CITATION 9 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 11 MORGAN A. TYSON, No. C 07-05784 JF (PR) 12 ORDER DENYING CERTIFICATE OF Petitioner, APPEALABILITY 13 VS. 14 ROBERT L. AYERS, Warden, 15 Respondent. 16 17 18 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding <u>pro</u> <u>se</u>, filed a petition for a writ of habeas 19 corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, challenging the California Board of Prison Terms' 20 decision denying parole. On August 31, 2009, the Court denied the instant petition on the merits and entered judgment in favor of Respondent. Petitioner filed a notice of appeal 21 and the matter was forwarded to the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. 22 23 On March 22, 2011, the Ninth Circuit remanded this case for the limited purpose of granting or denying a certificate of appealability. See Hayward v. Marshall, 603 F.3d 24 25 546 (9th Cir. 2010) (en banc) (overruling those portions of White v. Lambert, 370 F.3d 26 1002, 1004 (9th Cir. 2004), and Rosas v. Nielsen, 428 F.3d 1229, 1231-32 (9th Cir. 2005) 27 (per curiam), that relieved a prisoner from obtaining a certificate of appealability to 28 review the denial of a habeas petition challenging an administrative decision denying Order Denying COA 1 P:\PRO-SE\SJ.JF\HC.07\Tyson05784_denyCOA.wpd

Doc. 17

Dockets.Justia.com

Tyson v. Ayers et al

parole).

"Where a district court has rejected the constitutional claims on the merits, the showing required to satisfy § 2253(c) is straightforward: the petitioner must demonstrate 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). The Court denied the instant habeas petition after careful consideration of the merits. The Court found no violation of Petitioner's federal constitutional rights in the administrative decision denying parole. Petitioner has failed to demonstrate that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether this Court was correct in its ruling. Accordingly, a certificate of appealability is DENIED.

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

United States District Judge

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED:_______

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Case Number: CV07-05784 JF
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
employee in the Office of the Clerk, U.S. District
ERVED a true and correct copy(ies) of the ge paid envelope addressed to the person(s) in the U.S. Mail, or by placing said copy(ies) into the Clerk's office.
Richard W. Wieking, Clerk