

APR 28 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

TONY O. AREMU,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

B. CURRY, Warden,

Respondent - Appellee.

No. 09-55350

D.C. No. 2:06-cv-06158-CJC

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
Cormac J. Carney, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 20, 2011\*\*

Before: RYMER, THOMAS, and PAEZ, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Tony O. Aremu appeals pro se from the district court's judgment denying his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas petition. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2253, and we dismiss.

---

\* 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).

After briefing was completed in this case, this court held that a certificate of appealability (“COA”) is required to challenge the denial of parole. *See Hayward v. Marshall*, 603 F.3d 546, 554-55 (9th Cir. 2010) (en banc). Now the Supreme Court has held that the only federal right at issue in the parole context is procedural, and the only proper inquiry is what process the inmate received, not whether the state court decided the case correctly. *See Swarthout v. Cooke*, 131 S. Ct. 859, 862-63 (2011) (per curiam). Because Aremu has not has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right, we decline to certify his claims. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c).

**DISMISSED.**