

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA  
NORTHERN DIVISION

WILLIE ARTHUR SULLEN, #109276,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
v.	)	CIVIL ACTION NO. 2:05-CV-787-F
	)	
GWENDOLYN MOSLEY, et al.,	)	
	)	
Respondents.	)	

**RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

This cause of action is pending before this court on a 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition for habeas corpus relief filed by Willie Arthur Sullen [“Sullen”], a state inmate, on August 16, 2005. The petition establishes that the petitioner was convicted of first degree assault by the Circuit Court of Mobile County, Alabama on February 5, 1981. It is this conviction which the petitioner challenges in the instant petition for habeas corpus relief.

**DISCUSSION**

This court “in the exercise of its discretion and in furtherance of justice” may transfer the petitioner's application for writ of habeas corpus to “the district court for the district within which the State court was held which convicted” the petitioner. 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d). The petitioner attacks a conviction entered against him by the Circuit Court of Mobile County, Alabama. Mobile County is located within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Alabama. In light of the foregoing, the

court concludes that a transfer of this case to such other court for review and determination is appropriate.

### CONCLUSION

Accordingly, it is the RECOMMENDATION of the Magistrate Judge that this case be transferred to the United States District Court for the Southern District of Alabama pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d). It is further

ORDERED that on or before August 31, 2005 the parties may file objections to the Recommendation. Any objections filed must specifically identify the findings in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation to which the party is objecting. Frivolous, conclusive or general objections will not be considered by the District Court. The parties are advised that this Recommendation is not a final order of the court and, therefore, it is not appealable.

Failure to file written objections to the proposed findings and advisements in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation shall bar the party from a de novo determination by the District Court of issues covered in the Recommendation and shall bar the party from attacking on appeal factual findings in the Recommendation accepted or adopted by the District Court except upon grounds of plain error or manifest injustice. *Nettles v. Wainwright*, 677 F.2d 404 (5th Cir. 1982). *See Stein v. Reynolds Securities, Inc.*, 667 F.2d 33 (11th Cir. 1982). *See also Bonner v. City of Prichard*, 661 F.2d 1206 (11th Cir. 1981,

*en banc*), adopting as binding precedent all of the decisions of the former Fifth Circuit handed down prior to the close of business on September 30, 1981.

Done this 17<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2005.

/s/ Vanzetta Penn McPherson  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE