

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE THIRD CIRCUIT

No. 14-3330

SCOTT FARAH,
Appellant

v.

WARDEN LORETTO FCI; UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
JUSTICE; PRESIDENT UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;
ATTORNEY GENERAL UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

On Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Pennsylvania
(D.C. Civ. No. 3-14-cv-00104)
District Judge: Honorable Kim R. Gibson

Submitted for Possible Summary Action
Pursuant to Third Circuit LAR 27.4 and I.O.P. 10.6
March 26, 2015

Before: FUENTES, GREENAWAY, JR., AND VANASKIE, Circuit Judges

(Filed: August 19, 2015)

OPINION*

* This disposition is not an opinion of the full Court and pursuant to I.O.P. 5.7 does not constitute binding precedent.

PER CURIAM

Scott Farah is a federal prisoner serving a sentence imposed by the United States District Court for the District of New Hampshire. He is incarcerated at the Federal Correctional Institution in Loretto, Pennsylvania. Farah is one of at least fourteen Loretto inmates who have filed virtually identical habeas petitions under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 in the district of their confinement. Like those other inmates, Farah argues that the Bureau of Prisons has failed to provide a mechanism for “non-medical” reductions in sentences and that, under the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984, its alleged failure to do so invalidates his sentence and requires his immediate release from prison.

We have affirmed the District Court’s denial of twelve of these petitions. See Saunders v. President U.S., 588 F. App’x 207 (3d Cir. 2015) (Nos. 14-2822 & 14-4159); Belt v. President U.S., 582 F. App’x 91 (3d Cir. 2014) (No. 14-3095); Voelzke v. President U.S., 582 F. App’x 89 (3d Cir. 2014) (Nos. 14-3310, 14-3327 & 14-3329); Hendricks v. President U.S., 575 F. App’x 19 (3d Cir. 2014) (Nos. 14-2702 through 14-2708). (We dismissed a thirteenth related appeal as untimely at No. 14-3508.) Farah’s petition is substantively identical to the eight petitions we addressed in Saunders and Hendricks (though it lacks the additional claim we addressed in Belt and Voelzke).

Farah too appeals from the District Court’s order denying his petition. Appellees have filed a motion for summary action, to which Farah has not responded. This appeal presents no substantial question for the reasons we already have explained in addressing

the substantively identical petitions noted above. For those reasons, appellees' motion is granted and we will affirm. See 3d Cir. LAR 27.4 (2010); 3d Cir. I.O.P. 10.6.