

1
2
3
4 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
56 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
78 SERGIO T. TORRES, 1:10-cv-00339-DLB (HC)
9 Petitioner, ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY PETITION
v. SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED FOR LACK
OF JURISDICTION10 [Doc. 1]
11 PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,12 Respondent.
13 /14 Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus
15 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.16 Petitioner filed the instant petition for writ of habeas corpus on September 30, 2009 in the
17 United States District Court for the Northern District of California. (Court Doc. 1.) On February
18 19, 2010, the petition was transferred to this Court. (Court Doc. 8.)19 The Court has conducted a preliminary review of the Petition pursuant to Rule 4 of the
20 Rules Governing Habeas Corpus Petitions and finds it is without jurisdiction to hear the case as
21 Petitioner has named an improper respondent.22 A petitioner seeking habeas corpus relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 must name the state
23 officer having custody of him as the respondent to the petition. Rule 2 (a) of the Rules
24 Governing § 2254 Cases; Ortiz-Sandoval v. Gomez, 81 F.3d 891, 894 (9th Cir. 1996); Stanley v.
25 California Supreme Court, 21 F.3d 359, 360 (9th Cir. 1994). Normally, the person having
26 custody of an incarcerated petitioner is the warden of the prison in which the petitioner is
27 incarcerated because the warden has "day-to-day control over" the petitioner. Brittingham v.
28 United States, 982 F.2d 378, 379 (9th Cir. 1992); see, also, Stanley v. California Supreme Court,

1 21 F.3d 359, 360 (9th Cir. 1994). However, the chief officer in charge of state penal institutions
2 is also appropriate. Ortiz, 81 F.3d at 894; Stanley, 21 F.3d at 360. Where a petitioner is on
3 probation or parole, the proper respondent is his probation or parole officer and the official in
4 charge of the parole or probation agency or state correctional agency. Id.

5 In this case, petitioner names the State of California as Respondent. Although Petitioner
6 is currently in the custody of the State of California, the State cannot be considered the person
7 having day-to-day control over Petitioner.

8 Petitioner's failure to name a proper respondent requires dismissal of his habeas petition
9 for lack of jurisdiction. Stanley, 21 F.3d at 360; Olson v. California Adult Auth., 423 F.2d 1326,
10 1326 (9th Cir. 1970); see, also, Billiteri v. United States Bd. Of Parole, 541 F.2d 938, 948 (2d
11 Cir. 1976). However, in this case, the Court will give petitioner the opportunity to cure his defect
12 by amending the petition to name a proper respondent. See, West v. Louisiana, 478 F.2d 1026,
13 1029 (5th Cir.1973), *vacated in part on other grounds*, 510 F.2d 363 (5th Cir.1975) (en banc)
14 (allowing petitioner to amend petition to name proper respondent); Ashley v. State of
15 Washington, 394 F.2d 125 (9th Cir. 1968) (same).

16 Accordingly, the Court HEREBY ORDERS:

17 1. Petitioner SHALL SHOW CAUSE why the Petition should not be dismissed by
18 AMENDING the Petition to name a proper respondent within thirty (30) days of
19 the date of service of this order. To comply with this directive petitioner need
20 only submit a pleading titled "Amendment to Petition" in which he amends the
21 petition to name a proper respondent. As noted above, that individual is the
22 person having day to day custody over petitioner - usually the warden of the
23 institution where he is confined. The Amendment should be clearly and boldly
24 captioned as such and include the case number referenced above, and be an
25 original signed under penalty of perjury.

26 IT IS SO ORDERED.

27 Dated: April 23, 2010

28 /s/ Dennis L. Beck
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE