

**FILED**

FEB 08 2011

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

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

STEVEN ERNEST KUTYLO,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

T. E. VAUGHAN, Warden,

Respondent - Appellee.

No. 07-55829

D.C. No. CV-06-00099-VBF

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
Valerie Baker Fairbank, District Judge, Presiding

Argued and Submitted August 5, 2010  
Pasadena, California

Before: KOZINSKI, Chief Judge, REINHARDT and WARDLAW, Circuit Judges.

Steven Kutyllo appeals the denial of his petition for a writ of habeas corpus.

We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2553.

While Kutyllo has not obtained a certificate of appealability as required under 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c), he was correctly advised before he filed his petition

---

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

that under *Rosas v. Nielsen*, 428 F.3d 1229, 1232 (9th Cir. 2005), he did not need a COA. While we overruled this aspect of *Rosas* in *Hayward v. Marshall*, 603 F.3d 546 (9th Cir. 2010) (en banc), “[w]e may issue such a certificate sua sponte,” *id.* at 554. We therefore certify for appeal the issue of whether Kutylko was denied parole in violation of his federal right to due process.

In light of *Swarthout v. Cooke*, 562 U.S. ----, ----, 2011 WL 197627, at \*2 (2011), we conclude that Kutylko’s federal right of due process was not violated, because he was allowed an opportunity to be heard and was provided with a statement of the reasons why parole was denied. Accordingly, we affirm the district court’s denial of his habeas petition.

**AFFIRMED.**

FILED

FEB 08 2011

*Kutylo v. Vaughn*, No. 07-55829

REINHARDT, Circuit Judge, concurring:

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

Because the Supreme Court has held that whether there is “some evidence” to support a denial of parole, a right that California law affords inmates,<sup>1</sup> is “no part of the Ninth Circuit’s business,” *Swarthout v. Cooke*, No. 10-333, Slip Op. at 6 (Jan. 24, 2011), and for that reason only, I reluctantly concur.

---

<sup>1</sup>*S ee, e.g., In re Lawrence*, 44 Cal. 4th 1181, 1191 (Cal. 2008).