

SEP 28 2007

**CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS**

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

CLARANCE LE-ROND WILLIAMS,
a/k/a CLARENCE LEROND WILLIAMS,

Petitioner - Appellant,

v.

G. J. GIURBINO, Warden,

Respondent - Appellee.

No. 06-55321

D.C. No. CV-03-01545-AHM

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
A. Howard Matz, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted September 24, 2007**

Before: CANBY, TASHIMA and RAWLINSON, Circuit Judges.

California state prisoner Clarence Le-Rond Williams appeals pro se from the district court's judgment denying his 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition. We have jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2253, and we affirm.

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** This panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

Williams contends that his due process rights were violated when the California Department of Corrections (“CDC”) disallowed him 132 days of sentence credits. The record shows that the CDC acted in accordance with California state law and properly disallowed the credits at issue because they were duplicative of credits already received by Williams. *See* Cal. Penal Code § 2900.5(b); *People v. Bruner*, 9 Cal. 4th 1178, 1183-84, 1191-93 (1995). Therefore, the state courts’ denial of this claim was not contrary to, or an unreasonable application of, clearly established United States Supreme Court authority. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d); *cf. Hicks v. Oklahoma*, 447 U.S. 343, 346 (1980).

Williams’ contention that the disallowance of credits violated his plea agreement is belied by the record.

AFFIRMED.