

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

APR 28 2025

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

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

PHILLIP CAMILLO-AMISANO,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

J. ENGLEMAN, Warden,

Respondent - Appellee.

No. 24-5072

D.C. No. 2:24-cv-02064-ODW-JDE

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Otis D. Wright II, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 22, 2025**

Before: GRABER, H.A. THOMAS, and JOHNSTONE, Circuit Judges.

Federal prisoner Phillip Camillo-Amisano appeals pro se from the district court's judgment denying his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition, which challenged prison disciplinary proceedings that resulted in the loss of good conduct time. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review a district court's decision to

* 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).

deny a petition for habeas corpus de novo, *Lane v. Salazar*, 911 F.3d 942, 947 (9th Cir. 2018), and we affirm.

Among other due process protections during disciplinary hearings, a prisoner is entitled to call witnesses and present documentary evidence. *Wolff v. McDonnell*, 418 U.S. 539, 566 (1974). Camillo-Amisano claims he was not afforded these protections. The record does not support his allegations. In fact, the record shows that Camillo-Amisano declined to call any witnesses, was eventually provided with his medical records, and was diagnosed with a relevant medical condition *after* the fourth disciplinary proceeding underlying this appeal. The prison's decision to expunge Camillo-Amisano's disciplinary violations after his diagnosis is further evidence that it properly considered his medical records.

Moreover, the prison's findings are supported by "some evidence." *Superintendent v. Hill*, 472 U.S. 445, 455 (1985). Witness statements, medical records, chain of custody forms, and multiple admissions of guilt all supported the prison disciplinary violations.

Claims not raised in the petition are not cognizable on appeal. *United States v. Allen*, 157 F.3d 661, 667 (9th Cir. 1998). Accordingly, we decline to consider Camillo-Amisano's remaining allegations.

AFFIRMED.