

JUN 08 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

STEVEN ERIC WALKER,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

D. K. SISTO, Warden; ATTORNEY  
GENERAL OF THE STATE OF  
CALIFORNIA,

Respondents - Appellees.

No. 10-15163

D.C. No. 06-cv-02062-ATG

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
Alfred T. Goodwin, Circuit Judge, Presiding

Submitted May 24, 2011\*\*

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

---

\* 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).

California state prisoner Steven Eric Walker 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.

Walker contends that the Board's 2004 and 2005 decisions to deny him parole were 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). Because Walker raises no procedural challenges, we affirm.

Walker's request for additional briefing is denied.

**AFFIRMED.**