

JAN 26 2010

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>CARL DWAYNE BISHOP,</p> <p>Petitioner - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>ANTHONY HEDGPETH,</p> <p>Respondent - Appellee.</p>
--

No. 08-55193

D.C. No. CV-04-00014-DSF

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Dale S. Fischer, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted January 11, 2010**

Before: BEEZER, TROTT, and BYBEE, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Carl Dwayne Bishop appeals from the district court's order denying his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas petition. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2253, and we affirm.

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Bishop contends that the prosecutor's statements during a pretrial interview constituted a promise of leniency that rendered his confession involuntary. However, "in most circumstances, speculation that cooperation will benefit the defendant or even promises to recommend leniency are not sufficiently compelling to overbear a defendant's will." *United States v. Harrison*, 34 F.3d 886, 891 (9th Cir. 1994). The state court's determination that Bishop's statement was not coerced was neither contrary to, nor an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(1); *Withrow v. Williams*, 507 U.S. 680, 693-94 (1993) (providing factors relevant to evaluate possible coercion).

We construe Bishop's additional argument as a motion to expand the certificate of appealability. So construed, the motion is denied. *See* 9th Cir. R. 22-1(e); *see also Hiivala v. Wood*, 195 F.3d 1098, 1104-05 (9th Cir. 1999) (per curiam).

AFFIRMED.