

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 20-3109

Ikeisha Jacobs

Petitioner - Appellant

v.

Nanette Barnes, FCI Waseca Warden

Respondent - Appellee

Appeal from United States District Court
for the District of Minnesota

Submitted: September 1, 2021

Filed: September 7, 2021

[Unpublished]

Before LOKEN, COLLOTON, and STRAS, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Ikeisha Jacobs appeals the district court's¹ order denying her 28 U.S.C. § 2241 petition challenging a prison disciplinary proceeding that resulted in the loss of good

¹The Honorable Paul A. Magnuson, United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota, adopting the report and recommendations of the Honorable Hildy Bowbeer, United States Magistrate Judge for the District of Minnesota.

conduct time. We agree with the district court that no procedural due process violation occurred with regard to the proceedings, notwithstanding any delay that may have been inconsistent with prison policy. See Phillips v. Norris, 320 F.3d 844, 847 (8th Cir. 2003) (there is no federal constitutional liberty interest in having prison officials follow prison regulations). Jacobs received written notice of the revised charge against her, presented a written statement and testified at the hearing before the disciplinary hearing officer, waived an opportunity to have a staff representative and call witnesses at the hearing, and received a written copy of the hearing officer's decision containing an explanation of "some evidence" that supported the disciplinary decision. See Superintendent v. Hill, 472 U.S. 445, 454-56 (1985). The record does not support Jacobs's assertions of bias, false statements, and improper denial of material video. Accordingly, we affirm for the reasons stated in the magistrate judge's adopted report and recommendation. See 8th Cir. R. 47B.

We grant Jacobs's motion for return of the appellate filing fee, which she paid before being granted leave to proceed in forma pauperis, and direct that the amount paid be returned. Prison Litigation Reform Act filing-fee provisions do not apply to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 actions. See Malave v. Hedrick, 271 F.3d 1139, 1140 (8th Cir. 2001). We deny Jacobs's pending motions for appointment of counsel and to supplement the record.
