

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

JAMES A. BIGGINS,	§
	§
Petitioner Below-	§ No. 506, 2008
Appellant,	§
	§ Court Below—Superior Court
v.	§ of the State of Delaware,
	§ in and for Sussex County
STATE OF DELAWARE,	§ C.A. No. 08M-09-012
	§
Respondent Below-	§
Appellee.	§

Submitted: January 16, 2009

Decided: April 7, 2009

Before **STEELE**, Chief Justice, **JACOBS**, and **RIDGELY**, Justices.

**ORDER**

This 7<sup>th</sup> day of April 2009, upon consideration of the parties' briefs and the record below, it appears to the Court that:

(1) The appellant, James Biggins, filed this appeal from the Superior Court's order denying his petition for a writ of habeas corpus. We find no merit to Biggins' appeal. Accordingly, we affirm the Superior Court's judgment.

(2) The record reflects that Biggins was convicted and sentenced in 1997 to a thirty-year term of incarceration. He presently is housed at the Vaughn Correctional Center. In 2008, he filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus, asserting that correctional authorities had improperly transferred him from the general prison population to a maximum security housing unit in the facility.

Biggins argued that his confinement is illegal because it breached a 1982 consent order entered into by the Department of Correction (DOC), which required the DOC to adopt disciplinary procedures regarding classification movements. The Superior Court denied Biggins' petition for a writ on the ground that Biggins is legally detained pursuant to a valid commitment of the Superior Court.

(3) We agree. In Delaware, the writ of habeas corpus provides relief on a very limited basis.<sup>1</sup> Habeas relief is not available to a petitioner who is committed on a felony, "the species whereof is plainly and fully set forth in the commitment."<sup>2</sup> Biggins' commitment is proper on its face. As we held in denying a similar petition previously filed by Biggins, complaints relating to prison management and/or classification decisions are not the proper subject of a habeas corpus petition.<sup>3</sup>

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the judgment of the Superior Court is AFFIRMED.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ Henry duPont Ridgely  
Justice

---

<sup>1</sup> *Hall v. Carr*, 692 A.2d 88 (1997).

<sup>2</sup> 10 Del. C. §6902.

<sup>3</sup> *Biggins v. State*, 2007 WL 2309992 (Del. Aug. 14, 2007).