

AUG 26 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>NATHANIEL WILLIAMS,</p> <p>Petitioner - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>CLAUDE E. FINN,</p> <p>Respondent - Appellee.</p>
--

No. 09-16010

D.C. No. 2:06-cv-01546-GEB

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
Garland E. Burrell, Jr., District Judge, Presiding

Submitted August 10, 2010\*\*

Before: HAWKINS, McKEOWN, and IKUTA, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Nathaniel Williams appeals from the district court’s judgment denying his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas petition challenging the loss of good time credits following prison disciplinary proceedings for unlawful influence of staff. We have jurisdiction under 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).

Williams contends that his due process rights were violated when he was denied the opportunity to call four staff witnesses at the prison disciplinary hearing. In light of the record, the witnesses' proposed testimony was irrelevant and any exclusion was harmless. Therefore, the California court's determination that Williams was afforded his due process rights was not contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly established Supreme Court law. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d)(1); *see also Brecht v. Abrahamson*, 507 U.S. 619, 637 (1993); *Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. 539, 566 (1974).

**AFFIRMED.**