

JUN 08 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

RICARDO H. ROBINSON,  
  
Petitioner - Appellant,  
  
v.  
  
JAMES A. YATES,  
  
Respondent - Appellee.

No. 07-55129

D.C. No. CV-06-00133-DOC

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Central District of California  
David O. Carter, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 24, 2011\*\*

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

California state prisoner Ricardo H. Robinson appeals pro se from the district court's judgment denying his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas petition. 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).

Robinson contends that the Board's 2004 decision to deny him parole was not supported by "some evidence" and therefore violated his due process rights. 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, 863 (2011) (per curiam). Because Robinson raises no procedural challenges regarding his parole hearing, a COA cannot issue. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

Further, because Robinson has not has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right, we decline to certify his remaining claims. *Id.*

Robinson's motion for appointment of counsel is denied.

**DISMISSED.**