

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

JUL 3 2017

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

BRIAN L. BROWN,

Petitioner-Appellant,

v.

RICHARD IVES, Warden,

Respondent-Appellee.

Nos. 15-56885
16-55131

D.C. Nos. 2:14-cv-02518-SVW
2:14-cv-02643-SVW

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Stephen V. Wilson, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted June 26, 2017**

Before: PAEZ, BEA, and MURGUIA, Circuit Judges.

In these appeals, Brian L. Brown appeals pro se from the district court's judgments denying his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petitions challenging two prison disciplinary hearings. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review the denial of a section 2241 petition de novo, *see Tablada v. Thomas*, 533 F.3d

* 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).

800, 805 (9th Cir. 2008), and we affirm in both cases.

In Appeal No. 15-56885, Brown challenges the findings of the disciplinary hearing officer (“DHO”) that he committed (1) assault and threatening bodily harm, and (2) assault. In Appeal No. 16-55131, Brown again challenges the first finding. The record reflects that both of Brown’s disciplinary hearings comported with due process and “some evidence” supports the DHO’s findings. *See Superintendent v. Hill*, 472 U.S. 445, 455 (1985) (requirements of due process are satisfied if “some evidence” supports disciplinary decision); *Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. 539, 563-71 (1974) (setting forth due process requirements for prison disciplinary proceedings). We reject Brown’s challenges to the district court’s handling of his petitions.

Brown’s motions to file the untimely and oversized reply brief are granted. The Clerk shall file the reply brief at Docket Entry No. 39 in Appeal No. 15-56885, and at Docket Entry No. 38 in Appeal No. 16-55131.

AFFIRMED.