

JUN 08 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FRANKIE ENRIQUEZ,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

HARTLEY, Warden,

Respondent - Appellee.

No. 09-17321

D.C. No. 1:08-cv-00335-BTM

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Barry T. Moskowitz, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 24, 2011**

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

California state prisoner Frankie Enriquez 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 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).

Enriquez contends that the Board's 2006 decision to deny him parole was not supported by "some evidence" and therefore violated his due process rights. 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). Enriquez raises no procedural challenges. Additionally, to the extent Enriquez contends that the Board misapplied state law, that does not provide a basis for granting a federal writ of habeas corpus. *See id.*

AFFIRMED.