

1 imply the invalidity of a conviction” nor “necessarily spell speedier release” are not
2 cognizable on habeas. *Blair v. Martel*, 645 F.3d 1151, 1157 (9th Cir. 2011) (citing
3 *Skinner v. Switzer*, 131 S.Ct. 1289, 1298–1299 & n.13 (2011)).

4 To the extent that they can be discerned, Petitioner’s claims are not cognizable on
5 federal habeas. Because the Petition ostensibly attacks the legality of a decision of the
6 Small Claims Division of the Superior Court and the actions of prison mail room staff,
7 they may be appropriate under 42 U.S.C. § 1983. However, as they neither implicate the
8 validity of Petitioner’s conviction nor necessarily spell Petitioner’s speedier release, they
9 are not cognizable under 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

10 Based on the above discussion and pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing
11 Section 2254 cases in the United States District Court, it is therefore ordered that this
12 action be dismissed without prejudice.

13
14 DATED: MARCH 29, 2016



15
16
17 DEAN D. PREGERSON
18 United States District Judge

19
20 Presented by:

21
22 /S/FREDERICK F. MUMM
23 FREDERICK F. MUMM
24 United States Magistrate Judge
25
26
27
28