

OCT 06 2010

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>CEDRIC O. HOWARD,</p> <p>Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>DORIA SELLING,</p> <p>Defendant - Appellee.</p>

No. 08-16863

D.C. No. 2:08-cv-00786-RLH-RJJ

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of Nevada
Roger L. Hunt, Chief Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 13, 2010**

Before: SILVERMAN, CALLAHAN, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Cedric O. Howard, a Nevada state prisoner, appeals pro se from the district court’s judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging that the Nevada Parole Board denied him institutional parole. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a district court’s dismissal under 28 U.S.C.

* 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).

§ 1915(e)(2), *Barren v. Harrington*, 152 F.3d 1193, 1194 (9th Cir. 1998) (order), and 28 U.S.C. § 1915A, *Resnick v. Hayes*, 213 F.3d 443, 447 (9th Cir. 2000). We affirm.

The district court properly dismissed the action because Howard’s claim that he was denied institutional parole is *Heck*-barred. *See Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477, 486-87 (1994); *Butterfield v. Bail*, 120 F.3d 1023, 1024-25 (9th Cir. 1997) (“Few things implicate the validity of continued confinement more directly than the allegedly improper denial of parole.”).

AFFIRMED.