

JAN 02 2014

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>EMILIANO LOPEZ,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiff - Appellant,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>EDMUND G. BROWN, Jr., Governor of California; et al.,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendants - Appellees.</p>
--

No. 12-17830

D.C. No. 1:12-cv-01065-LJO-GSA

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Lawrence J. O’Neill, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted December 17, 2013**

Before: GOODWIN, WALLACE, and GRABER, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Emiliano Lopez appeals pro se from the district court’s judgment dismissing his 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging federal constitutional violations in connection with his parole hearing. We have

* 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).

jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de novo a district court's dismissal under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1915A and 1915(e)(2)(B) (ii). *Resnick v. Hayes*, 213 F.3d 443, 447 (9th Cir. 2000); *Barren v. Harrington*, 152 F.3d 1193, 1194 (9th Cir. 1998) (order). We reverse and remand.

The district court entered a judgment of dismissal of Lopez's action because his claims sounded in habeas and could entitle him to earlier release. However, success in this action would not necessarily demonstrate the invalidity of his continued confinement and, therefore, Lopez's claims are not barred under *Heck v. Humphrey*, 512 U.S. 477, 483-87 (1994). *See Wilkinson v. Dotson*, 544 U.S. 74, 81-82 (2005) (prisoner may challenge procedures used in parole hearing under § 1983, provided he does not seek "immediate or speedier release"). Accordingly, we reverse and remand for further proceedings.

REVERSED and REMANDED.