

DEC 21 2011

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

WILLIAM BLAINE MAYFIELD,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

THOMAS L. CAREY and ATTORNEY  
GENERAL OF THE STATE OF  
CALIFORNIA,

Respondents - Appellees.

No. 09-15195

D.C. No. 2:04-cv-01182-JAM-  
DAD

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
John A. Mendez, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 19, 2011\*\*

Before: GOODWIN, WALLACE and McKEOWN, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner William Blaine Mayfield appeals 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).

Mayfield contends that the Governor's 2002 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. *Swarthout v. Cooke*, 131 S. Ct. 859, 863 (2011); *Styre v. Adams*, 645 F.3d 1106, 1108 (9th Cir. 2011) (acknowledging *Cooke* and holding that due process does not require Governor to hold second suitability hearing before reversing parole grant); *Roberts v. Hartley*, 640 F.3d 1042, 1045-47 (9th Cir. 2011) (applying *Cooke*). Because Mayfield raises no procedural challenges, we affirm.

**AFFIRMED.**