

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT

---

No. 98-40280  
Conference Calendar

---

JULIAN PRICE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

versus

VICTOR RODRIGUEZ, Chairman, Individually and in official capacity; JOHN DOE, Executive Director, Individually and in official capacity; THOMAS W. MOSS, Board Member, Individually and in official capacity; DANIEL LANG, Board Member, Individually and in official capacity; MARY LEAL, Board Member, Individually and in official capacity; PAUL PREJEAN, Board Member, Individually and in official capacity; CYNTHIA TAUSS, Board Member, Individually and in official capacity; MAE JACKSON, Board Member, Individually and in official capacity; WINONA W. MILES, Board Member, Individually and in official capacity; TERRI SCHNORRENBERG, Board Member, Individually and in official capacity; IRMA CAULEY, Board Member, Individually and in official capacity; BENNIE ELMORE, Board Member, Individually and in official capacity; DONNA GILBERT, Board Member, Individually and in official capacity; JOHN ESCOBEDO, Board Member, Individually and in official capacity; GERALD GARRETT, Board Member, Individually and in official capacity; BRENOLYN ROGERS-GARDNER, Board Member, Individually and in official capacity; W.G. "BILLY" WALKER, Board Member, Individually and in official capacity; GILBERT RODRIGUEZ, Board Member, Individually and in official capacity; ALBERTO SANCHEZ, Board Member, Individually and in official capacity; TEXAS BOARD OF PARDONS & PAROLES,

Defendants-Appellees.

- - - - -  
Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of Texas  
USDC No. 6:97-CV-1050  
- - - - -

February 17, 2000

Before EMILIO M. GARZA, BENAVIDES, and DENNIS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:\*

---

\* Pursuant to 5TH CIR. R. 47.5, the court has determined that this opinion should not be published and is not precedent except under the limited circumstances set forth in 5TH CIR. R. 47.5.4.

Julian Price, Texas prisoner #622876, appeals from the dismissal of his suit for failure to exhaust state-court remedies. He contends that the defendants' parole review procedures violated his due process rights and the Ex Post Facto Clause.

Because Texas parole statutes confer no liberty interest, Price has no claim for violation of due process in the procedures attendant to parole decisions. See Orellana v. Kyle, 65 F.3d 29, 32 (5th Cir. 1995). Price fails to show that any change in the law regarding the amount of discretion accorded the Texas Board of Pardons and Paroles to deny him release on parole made the punishment for his crime more burdensome. See Hallmark v. Johnson, 118 F.3d 1073, 1078 (5th Cir. 1997). The judgment of the district court is AFFIRMED.