

NOT FOR PUBLICATION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

GEZO EDWARDS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

SILVER, Associate Warden; WARDEN,

Respondents - Appellees.

No. 24-7779

D.C. No.

1:24-cv-01103-JLT-SKO

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Eastern District of California
Jennifer L. Thurston, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted April 22, 2025**

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

Federal prisoner Gezo Edwards appeals pro se from the district court's judgment dismissing his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition, which challenged prison disciplinary proceedings that resulted in the temporary loss of commissary privileges. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review a district

* 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).

court's determinations regarding habeas corpus jurisdiction de novo, *Pinson v. Carvajal*, 69 F.4th 1059, 1063 (9th Cir. 2023), and we affirm.

Habeas corpus jurisdiction exists if a prisoner claims he has been subjected, without due process, to greater restrictions of liberty, denial of good time credits, or a disciplinary record would affect his eligibility for parole. *Bostic v. Carlson*, 884 F.2d 1267, 1269 (9th Cir. 1989), *overruled on other grounds by Nettles v. Grounds*, 830 F.3d 922 (9th Cir. 2016) (en banc). Edwards, who was sentenced to prison for life in 2014, is ineligible for parole or good time credits. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3624(b)(1). A temporary loss of commissary privileges is not a greater restriction on Edwards's liberty, and his remaining allegations are insufficient to invoke habeas jurisdiction.

AFFIRMED.