

United States Court of Appeals
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

No. 10-2679

Lamont Gentry Falls,

Appellant,

v.

Dwight L. Fondren,

Appellee.

*

*

*

* Appeal from the United States

* District Court for the

* District of Minnesota.

*

* [UNPUBLISHED]

*

Submitted: March 7, 2011

Filed: March 8, 2011

Before MELLOY, GRUENDER, and BENTON, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Federal inmate Lamont Gentry Falls appeals from the district court's¹ denial of his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 petition, in which he challenged disciplinary proceedings that ultimately resulted in, among other things, a loss of good conduct time. Upon careful de novo review, see Mitchell v. U.S. Parole Comm'n, 538 F.3d 948, 951 (8th Cir. 2008) (per curiam), we agree with the district court that Falls was adequately afforded due process in the disciplinary proceedings, and we agree with the conclusion that the

¹The Honorable James M. Rosenbaum, United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota, adopting the report and recommendations of the Honorable Franklin L. Noel, United States Magistrate Judge for the District of Minnesota.

disciplinary decision was supported by the evidence. See, e.g., Superintendent v. Hill, 472 U.S. 445, 455-56 (1985) (requirements of due process are satisfied if “some evidence” supports disciplinary decision to revoke good time credits).²

Accordingly, the judgment is affirmed. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

²We decline to consider Falls’s newly raised claim regarding evidence allegedly withheld from him. See Stone v. Harry, 364 F.3d 912, 914 (8th Cir. 2004) (claims not presented in district court may not be advanced for first time on appeal).