

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JAN 23 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

JULIO CESAR MORALES,

No. 15-17388

Petitioner-Appellant,

D.C. No. 2:14-cv-01729-DJH

v.

MEMORANDUM\*

CHARLES L. RYAN and ATTORNEY  
GENERAL OF THE STATE OF  
ARIZONA,

Respondents-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of Arizona  
Diane J. Humetewa, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted January 18, 2017\*\*

Before: TROTT, TASHIMA, and CALLAHAN, Circuit Judges.

Arizona state prisoner Julio Cesar Morales appeals pro se from the district court's judgment denying his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas corpus petition. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 2253. We review a district court's denial of a

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

habeas corpus petition de novo, *see Stanley v. Cullen*, 633 F.3d 852, 859 (9th Cir. 2011), and we affirm.

Morales contends that his second trial counsel rendered ineffective assistance by promising, but failing to obtain, a more favorable plea offer. The Arizona Court of Appeals' rejection of this claim was not contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, *Strickland v. Washington*, 466 U.S. 668 (1984), nor an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in state court. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d); *Harrington v. Richter*, 562 U.S. 86, 100-103 (2011).

We treat Morales's additional argument as a motion to expand the certificate of appealability and deny the motion. *See* 9th Cir. R. 22-1(e); *Hiivala v. Wood*, 195 F.3d 1098, 1104-05 (9th Cir. 1999).

**AFFIRMED.**