
**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

COURTHOUSE ADDRESS:

Clara Shortridge Foltz Criminal Justice Center
210 West Temple Street
Los Angeles, CA 90012

ROBERT R. SNYDER,

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

CCP, § 1013(a)
Cal. Rules of Court, rule 2(a)(1)

CONFORMED COPY
ORIGINAL FILED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CLIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

APR 23 2018

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk

BY G. ALONZO, DEPUTY

Gabriela Alonzo

CASE NUMBER: BH011690

(Los Angeles County Super. Ct. No. GA064579)

I, the below-named Executive Officer of the above-entitled court, do hereby certify that I am not a party to the cause herein, and that this date I served:
Memorandum of Decision (Habeas Corpus)

I certify that the following is true and correct: I am the clerk of the above-named court and not a party to the cause. I served this document by placing true copies in envelopes addressed as shown below and then by sealing and placing them for collection; stamping or metering with first-class, prepaid postage; and mailing on the date stated below, in the United States mail at Los Angeles County, California, following standard court practices.

Robert R. Snyder, #AC9136
California State Prison, Los Angeles County
P.O. Box 8457
Lancaster, CA 93539-8457

Department of Justice – State of California
Office of the Attorney General
300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, CA 90013
Attn: Julie Malone, Supervising Deputy Att. General

DATED AND DEPOSITED April 23, 2018
SHERRI R. CARTER, Executive Officer/Clerk
By: _____ G. ALONZO _____, Clerk
Gabriela Alonzo

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, DEPT 100**

Date: April 20, 2018
Honorable: WILLIAM C. RYAN, Judge
S. KADOHATA, Deputy Clerk

BH011690
(Los Angeles County Super. Ct. No. GA064579)

In re:
ROBERT R. SNYDER,

Petitioner,

On Habeas Corpus

Nature of Proceedings: MEMORANDUM OF
DECISION (Habeas Corpus)
AT CHAMBERS

Petition for writ of habeas corpus by Robert R. Snyder, *pro se* ("Petitioner"). No appearance by a Respondent. Denied.

Petitioner was received in the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation ("CDCR") on April 1, 2010. Petitioner is currently incarcerated at California State Prison, Los Angeles County.

On March 28, 2018, Petitioner filed the instant petition requesting that the court "authorize complaints against the prison appeals office personnel to go directly to the local courts, due to

how an inmate 602/appeal against an appeals processor/coordinate..., cannot fairly be decided by their own office without obvious bias...” (Petition, p.1.) Petitioner alleges that the “purpose of this document is to bring these oppressive practices into clear view while hoping to see this excellent court retain appellate jurisdiction for this important matter.” (*Ibid.*) Petitioner claims that the “issues presented here are made on behalf of all prisoners confined in a CDCR prison” and seeks a “State wide policy change.” (*Id.* at pp. 2, 4.)

In this case, Petitioner has not shown that he is entitled to such relief, as there is no liberty interest in the processing of an administrative appeal because inmates do not have a separate constitutional entitlement to a specific grievance procedure. (In re *Williams* (2015) 241 Cal.App.4th 738, 744 (*Williams*)). In *Williams*, the petitioner challenged the manner in which appeals coordinators process his appeal by filing a habeas petition. (*Id.* at pp. 740-742, 744.) The Court of Appeal held that the petitioner “failed to meet his burden of showing the manner in which the appeals coordinators exercised their discretion in processing his lost-property appeal ‘present[s] the type of atypical, significant deprivation in which a State might conceivably create a liberty interest’ [citation]. A prison inmate’s ‘claimed loss of a liberty interest in the processing of his [administrative] appeals does not satisfy this standard, because inmates lack a separate constitutional entitlement to a specific prison grievance procedure.’ [Citations.] ‘[T]o hold as we are urged to do that *any* substantial deprivation imposed by prison authorities triggers the procedural protections

of the Due Process Clause would subject to judicial review a wide spectrum of discretionary actions that traditionally have been the business of prison administrators....' [Citation.]" (*Id.* at p. 744.)

Courts generally defer to prison authorities in running the prison system, which limits judicial intervention to actions by prison officials that are arbitrary, capricious, irrational, or an abuse of discretion. (*In re Jenkins* (2010) 50 Cal.4th 1167, 1175-1176.) The judiciary must grant great deference to a prison's administrative expertise because courts are ill equipped to deal with the complex and difficult problems of prison administration. (*In re Collins* (2001) 86 Cal.App.4th 1176, 1182.) It is only when a prison deprives an inmate of life, liberty, or property in a manner that falls outside the expected parameters of the sentence imposed that the due process clause is invoked. (*In re Johnson* (2009) 176 Cal.App.4th 290, 297; *Sandin v. Conner* (1995) 515 U.S. 472, 485.) In this case, Petitioner has not shown that there was any due process violation.

Further, to the extent that Petitioner is seeking legislative reform, this court does not have the authority to grant Petitioner such relief. The California Constitution provides: "The powers of state government are legislative, executive, and judicial. Persons charged with the exercise of one power may not exercise either of the others except as permitted by this Constitution." (Cal. Const., art. III, § 3.) It is well established that policy considerations resulting from the enactment of laws is solely a legislative function; the judiciary is not tasked with evaluating the wisdom of the policies embodied in

legislation. (*Superior Court v. County of Mendocino* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 45, 53.)

For the foregoing reasons, Petitioner has not stated a prima facie case for relief and the petition is DENIED. (*People v. Duvall* (1995) 9 Cal.4th 464, 475.)

The Clerk is ordered to serve a copy of this decision upon the Petitioner, and upon the Attorney General, as counsel for the respondent Secretary of the Department of Corrections.

The court order is signed and filed this date.

A true copy of this minute order is sent via U.S. Mail to the following parties:

Robert R. Snyder, #AC9136
California State Prison, Los Angeles County
P.O. Box 8457
Lancaster, CA 93539-8457

Department of Justice – State of California
Office of the Attorney General
300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, CA 90013
Attn: Julie Malone, Supervising Deputy Att. General

Minutes Entered 04-20-18 County Clerk

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF
THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION FOUR**

In re)	B290370
ROBERT R. SNYDER,)	
)	(Los Angeles County
On Habeas Corpus.)	Super. Ct. No.
)	BH011690)
)	(W. Ryan, Judge)
)	ORDER

Description: Petition summarily denied by order

Date: 06/21/2018

Disposition Type: Final

THE COURT: The petition for writ of habeas corpus filed May 31, 2018, has been read and considered and is denied on grounds petitioner has not stated facts or evidence sufficient to state a prima facie case for relief. (See Judge Ryan's April 20, 2018 Memorandum of Decision; and see *In re Jenkins* (2010) 50 Cal.4th 1167, 1175-1176; *In re Williams* (2015) 241 Cal.App.4th 738, 744; Jr.: *In re Johnson* (2009) 176 Cal.App.4th 290, 297.)

App. 8

Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District,
Division Four – No. B290370

S249683

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

En Banc

In Re ROBERT RYAN SNYDER on Habeas Corpus.

The Petition for review is denied.

SUPREME COURT

FILED

AUG 08 2018

Jorge Navarrete, Clerk

Deputy

CANTIL-SAKAUTE

Chief Justice

App. 9

Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District,
Division Four – No. B279622

S240951

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

En Banc

In Re ROBERT RYAN SNYDER on Habeas Corpus.

The Petition for review is denied.

SUPREME COURT

FILED

MAY 17 2017

Jorge Navarrete, Clerk

Deputy

CANTIL-SAKAUTE

Chief Justice

App. 10

Court of Appeal, Second Appellate District,
Division Four – No. B278368

S238204
IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA
En Banc

ROBERT R. SNYDER, Petitioner
v.
SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT,
Respondent;

THE PEOPLE, Real Party in Interest.

The Petition for review is denied.

SUPREME COURT

FILED

DEC 14 2016

Jorge Navarrete, Clerk

Deputy

CANTIL-SAKAUTE

Chief Justice