

1 **FAILURE TO NAME PROPER RESPONDENT**

2 Review of the Petition reveals that Petitioner has failed to name a proper respondent. On
3 federal habeas, a state prisoner must name the state officer having custody of him as the
4 respondent. *Ortiz-Sandoval v. Gomez*, 81 F.3d 891, 894 (9th Cir. 1996) (citing Rule 2(a), 28
5 U.S.C. foll. § 2254). Federal courts lack personal jurisdiction when a habeas petition fails to
6 name a proper respondent. *See id.*

7 The warden is the typical respondent. However, “the rules following section 2254 do not
8 specify the warden.” *Id.* “[T]he ‘state officer having custody’ may be ‘either the warden of the
9 institution in which the petitioner is incarcerated . . . or the chief officer in charge of state penal
10 institutions.’” *Id.* (quoting Rule 2(a), 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254 advisory committee’s note). If “a
11 petitioner is in custody due to the state action he is challenging, ‘[t]he named respondent shall
12 be the state officer who has official custody of the petitioner (for example, the warden of the
13 prison).’” *Id.* (quoting Rule 2, 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254 advisory committee’s note).

14 A long standing rule in the Ninth Circuit holds “that a petitioner may not seek [a writ of]
15 habeas corpus against the State under . . . [whose] authority . . . the petitioner is in custody. The
16 actual person who is [the] custodian [of the petitioner] must be the respondent.” *Ashley v.*
17 *Washington*, 394 F.2d 125, 126 (9th Cir. 1968). This requirement exists because a writ of
18 habeas corpus acts upon the custodian of the state prisoner, the person who will produce “the
19 body” if directed to do so by the Court. “Both the warden of a California prison and the Director
20 of Corrections for California have the power to produce the prisoner.” *Ortiz-Sandoval*, 81 F.3d
21 at 895.

22 Here, Petitioner has incorrectly named “James Hartley, Warden,” as Respondent. In order
23 for this Court to entertain the Petition filed in this action, Petitioner must name the warden in
24 charge of the state correctional facility in which Petitioner is presently confined or the Director
25 of the California Department of Corrections. *Brittingham v. United States*, 982 F.2d 378, 379
26 (9th Cir. 1992) (per curiam).

27 ///

28 ///


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, the Court **GRANTS** Petitioner’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis and **DISMISSES** the Petition without prejudice and with leave to amend. To have this case reopened, Petitioner must, **no later than January 3, 2011**, file a First Amended Petition which cures the pleading deficiencies outlined in this Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: November 2, 2010


WILLIAM Q. HAYES
United States District Judge