

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

LAKEISHA RAY TODD,)	
# 250479)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	Civil Action No. 2:09cv412-TMH
)	(WO)
CYNTHIA S. WHEELER-WHITE, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Respondents.)	

RECOMMENDATION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE

This case is before the court on a *pro se* 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition for habeas corpus relief filed by Lakeisha Ray Todd (“Todd”), a state inmate incarcerated at ADOC Work Relief in Birmingham, Alabama. In her petition, Todd challenges a prison sentence imposed on her in November 2006 by the Circuit Court for Mobile County, Alabama, a state trial court. Todd asks the trial court to award her credit against her sentence for the time she spent free on bond prior to sentencing.

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). Todd attacks a sentence imposed on her by the Circuit Court for Mobile County, Alabama, and requests that the Court award her credit against her sentence for time she spent on bond prior

to sentencing. Mobile County is located within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Southern District of Alabama. In light of the foregoing, this 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 May 20, 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 7th day of May, 2009.

/s/Wallace Capel, Jr.
WALLACE CAPEL, JR.
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE