1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
12	JULIO C. MORALES-DOMINGUEZ, 1:12-CV-01732 LJO GSA HC
13	aka CESAR GUZMAN, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION
14	Petitioner, REGARDING PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS PURSUANT TO 28
15	v. U.S.C. § 2241
16 17	GILL, Warden,
18	Respondent.
10	/
20	Petitioner is a federal prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus
21	pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241.
22	Petitioner filed the instant petition for writ of habeas corpus on October 24, 2012. He is
23	challenging his 2010 conviction in the United States District Court for the Western District of Texas
24	of illegal re-entry and violation of probation. Petitioner is in the custody of the Bureau of Prisons at
25	the Federal Correctional Institution located in Mendota, California.
26	DISCUSSION
27	A federal prisoner who wishes to challenge the validity or constitutionality of his conviction
28	or sentence must do so by way of a motion to vacate, set aside, or correct the sentence under 28
t	

U.S.C. § 2255. <u>Tripati v. Henman</u>, 843 F.2d 1160, 1162 (9th Cir.1988); <u>Thompson v. Smith</u>, 719
F.2d 938, 940 (8th Cir.1983); <u>In re Dorsainvil</u>, 119 F.3d 245, 249 (3rd 1997); <u>Broussard v. Lippman</u>,
643 F.2d 1131, 1134 (5th Cir.1981). In such cases, *only the sentencing court has jurisdiction*.
<u>Tripati</u>, 843 F.2d at 1163. A prisoner may not collaterally attack a federal conviction or sentence by
way of a petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. <u>Grady v. United States</u>,
929 F.2d 468, 470 (9th Cir.1991); <u>Tripati</u>, 843 F.2d at 1162; <u>see also United States v. Flores</u>, 616
F.2d 840, 842 (5th Cir.1980).

In contrast, a federal prisoner challenging the manner, location, or conditions of that
sentence's execution must bring a petition for writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241.
<u>Capaldi v. Pontesso</u>, 135 F.3d 1122, 1123 (6th Cir. 1998); <u>United States v. Tubwell</u>, 37 F.3d 175,
177 (5th Cir. 1994); <u>Kingsley v. Bureau of Prisons</u>, 937 F.2d 26, 30 n.5 (2nd Cir. 1991); <u>United</u>
<u>States v. Jalili</u>, 925 F.2d 889, 893-94 (6th Cir. 1991); <u>Barden v. Keohane</u>, 921 F.2d 476, 478-79 (3rd
Cir. 1991); <u>United States v. Hutchings</u>, 835 F.2d 185, 186-87 (8th Cir. 1987); <u>Brown v. United</u>
<u>States</u>, 610 F.2d 672, 677 (9th Cir. 1990).

15 A federal prisoner authorized to seek relief under § 2255 may seek relief under § 2241 *if* he 16 can show that the remedy available under § 2255 is "inadequate or ineffective to test the validity of 17 his detention." United States v. Pirro, 104 F.3d 297, 299 (9th Cir.1997) (quoting § 2255). Although 18 there is little guidance from any court on when § 2255 is an inadequate or ineffective remedy, the 19 Ninth Circuit has recognized that it is a very narrow exception. Id; Holland v. Pontesso, 234 F.3d 20 1277 (9th Cir. 2000) (Section 2255 not inadequate or ineffective because Petitioner misses statute of 21 limitations); Moore v. Reno, 185 F.3d 1054, 1055 (9th Cir.1999) (Dismissal of a successive motion 22 attacking sentence did not render such motion procedure an ineffective or inadequate remedy, so as 23 to authorize federal prisoner to seek habeas relief); Aronson v. May, 85 S.Ct. 3, 5 (1964) (a court's 24 denial of a prior § 2255 motion is insufficient to render § 2255 inadequate.); Tripati, 843 F.2d at 25 1162-63 (9th Cir.1988) (a petitioner's fears bias or unequal treatment do not render a § 2255 petition 26 inadequate); Williams v. Heritage, 250 F.2d 390 (9th Cir.1957); Hildebrandt v. Swope, 229 F.2d 582 (9th Cir.1956); see, United States v. Valdez-Pacheco, 237 F.3d 1077 (9th Cir. 2001) (procedural 27 28 requirements of § 2255 may not be circumvented by invoking the All Writs Act, 28 U.S.C. § 1651).

The burden is on the petitioner to show that the remedy is inadequate or ineffective. <u>Redfield v.</u>
 <u>United States</u>, 315 F.2d 76, 83 (9th Cir. 1963).

In this case, Petitioner challenges the underlying conviction and sentence. Because he is
alleging errors in his conviction and sentence, and not errors in the administration of his sentence,
the Court finds that Petitioner is not entitled to relief under § 2241, and his petition should be
dismissed. In addition, Petitioner makes no claim that § 2255 is inadequate or ineffective. Should
the Petitioner wish to pursue his claims in federal court, he must do so by way of a motion to vacate
or set aside pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255.¹ The petition must be dismissed.

RECOMMENDATION

Accordingly, the Court RECOMMENDS that the petition for writ of habeas corpus be
DISMISSED because the petition does not allege grounds that would entitle Petitioner to relief under
28 U.S.C. § 2241.

13 These Findings and Recommendations are submitted to the Honorable Lawrence J. O'Neill, United States District Court Judge, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Rule 14 15 304 of the Local Rules of Practice for the United States District Court, Eastern District of California. 16 Within thirty (30) days after being served with a copy, Petitioner may file written objections with the 17 Court. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and 18 Recommendations." The Court will then review the Magistrate Judge's ruling pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 19 § 636 (b)(1)(C). Petitioner is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may 20 waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). 21 22 IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated: November 13, 2012 23 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 24 25 26

9

 ¹A petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to § 2255 must be filed in the court where petitioner was originally
 sentenced. In this case, Petitioner challenges convictions and sentences adjudicated in the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Texas.