

SEP 29 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>TERRENCE O’SULLIVAN,</p> <p>Petitioner - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>STEVE MOORE,</p> <p>Respondent - Appellee.</p>
--

No. 10-15700

D.C. No. 2:08-cv-01469-MCE-JFM

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Morrison C. England, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 27, 2011 **

Before: HAWKINS, SILVERMAN and W. FLETCHER, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Terrence O’Sullivan 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).

O’Sullivan contends that the Board of Prison Terms' 2006 decision to deny him parole was not supported by reliable 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, 862–63 (2011) (per curiam). Because O’Sullivan raises no federal procedural challenges, we affirm.

AFFIRMED.