

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

TIJUANA L. WARD,)	
# 244936,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v)	Civil Action No. 2:09cv127-TMH
)	(WO)
STATE OF ALABAMA, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Respondents.)	

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

This case is before the court on a 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition for habeas corpus relief filed by Tijuana L. Ward, a state inmate, on or around February 20, 2009. In her petition, Ward challenges a sentence imposed upon her by the Circuit Court for Dallas County, Alabama, a state trial court. Ward appears to seek an award of jail credit from the aforementioned state court for time spent in pretrial confinement.

DISCUSSION

This court “in the exercise of its discretion and in furtherance of justice” may transfer an 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). Ward attacks a sentence imposed upon her by the Circuit Court for Dallas County, Alabama, and requests that the trial court award her jail credit for time served in pretrial confinement. Dallas

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 transfer of this case to such other court for review and disposition 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 April 3, 2009, the parties may file objections to the Recommendation. Any objections filed must specifically identify the findings in the Magistrate Judge's Recommendation to which a party objects. 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 18th day of March, 2009.

/s/Terry F. Moorer
TERRY F. MOORER
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE