

MAR 12 2012

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>ALBERT ALVIN WILLIAMS,</p> <p>Petitioner - Appellant,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>D. K. SISTO, Warden,</p> <p>Respondent - Appellee.</p>
--

No. 09-17866

D.C. No. 2:07-cv-02692-WBS

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
William B. Shubb, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted March 6, 2012**

Before: B. FLETCHER, REINHARDT, and TASHIMA, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Albert Alvin Williams 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).

Williams contends that the Board of Parole Hearings's 2006 decision that he was unsuitable for parole was not supported by "some evidence" and therefore violated his due process rights. The only 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 Williams raises no procedural challenges, we affirm.

AFFIRMED.