

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

LA'SHUNDA C. LATHAM,	)	
# 248494,	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civil Action No. 2:09cv521-ID
	)	(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 La’Shunda C. Latham (“Latham”), an Alabama inmate incarcerated at the ADOC Work Release/Community Work Center in Birmingham. By her petition, Latham challenges matters associated with her sentence for manslaughter, which was entered against her in August 2003 by the Circuit Court for Etowah County, Alabama, a state trial court.

**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. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d). Latham seeks to challenge matters associated with her sentence imposed in 2003 by the Circuit Court for Etowah County, Alabama. Etowah County is located within the jurisdiction of the United States District Court for the Northern 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.<sup>1</sup>

## CONCLUSION

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

It is further

ORDERED that on or before **June 23, 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 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982). *See Stein v. Reynolds Securities, Inc.*, 667 F.2d 33 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1982). *See also Bonner v. City of Prichard*, 661 F.2d 1206 (11<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1981) (*en*

---

<sup>1</sup>In transferring this case, the court makes no determination with respect to the merits of any of Latham's claims and deems such matters as more appropriately addressed by the transferee court.

*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 10<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2009.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/Charles S. Coody\_\_\_\_\_  
CHARLES S. COODY  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE