

MAR 14 2017

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

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

DENNIS L. HAMILTON,

Petitioner-Appellant,

v.

BOARD OF PAROLE HEARINGS and  
Neil McDowell, Warden,

Respondents-Appellees.

No. 11-16437

D.C. No. 1:10-cv-01972-OWW

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
Oliver W. Wanger, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted March 8, 2017\*\*

Before: LEAVY, W. FLETCHER, and OWENS, Circuit Judges.

Dennis L. Hamilton appeals pro se from the district court's judgment denying his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 habeas petition challenging a 2009 decision by the

---

\* 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).

Board of Parole Hearings denying parole and deferring his next parole hearing in accordance with California Penal Code § 3041.5 (“Marsy’s Law”). We dismiss.

This court issued a certificate of appealability (“COA”) on whether application of Marsy’s Law to delay Hamilton’s next parole hearing violates the Ex Post Facto Clause. We vacate the COA as improvidently granted and dismiss this appeal for lack of jurisdiction. *See Nettles v. Grounds*, 830 F.3d 922, 934-35 (9th Cir. 2016) (en banc) (holding that claims fall outside “the core of habeas corpus” if success will not necessarily lead to immediate or earlier release from confinement), *cert. denied*, 580 U.S. \_\_\_ (U.S. Jan. 9, 2017) (No. 16-6556); *Phelps v. Alameda*, 366 F.3d 722, 727-28, 730 (9th Cir. 2004) (merits panel has the power to rule on the propriety of a COA).

The dismissal of this appeal does not preclude Hamilton from pursuing conditions of confinement claims in a properly filed civil rights action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

All pending motions are denied as moot.

**DISMISSED.**