Doc. 6

2254(a). A habeas corpus petition is the correct method for a prisoner to challenge the "legality or duration" of his confinement. <u>Badea v. Cox</u>, 931 F.2d 573, 574 (9th Cir. 1991), *quoting*,

Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475, 485 (1973); Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 1 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. In contrast, a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §

1983 is the proper method for a prisoner to challenge the conditions of that confinement.

McCarthy v. Bronson, 500 U.S. 136, 141-42 (1991); <u>Preiser</u>, 411 U.S. at 499; <u>Badea</u>, 931 F.2d at 574; Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 1 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases.

In this case, Petitioner is challenging the sufficiency of the evidence of his gang validation which resulted in his placement in the security housing unit. Specifically, Petitioner claims that he was segregated to an indefinite term in the security housing unit without sufficient evidence to demonstrate that he is an active member of a gang. Petitioner is challenging the conditions of his confinement, not the fact or duration of that confinement. Thus, Petitioner is not entitled to habeas corpus relief, and this petition must be dismissed. Should Petitioner wish to pursue his claims, he must do so by way of a civil rights complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

To the extent Petitioner contends that his placement in the SHU has prevented him from earning custody credits, there is no federal liberty interest in an inmate's ability to earn future credits, as distinct from credits already earned. Sandin v. Conner, 315 U.S. 472 (1995).

## RECOMMENDATION

Accordingly, the Court RECOMMENDS that the petition for writ of habeas corpus be DISMISSED because the petition does not allege grounds that would entitle Petitioner to habeas corpus relief.

This Findings and Recommendation is submitted to the assigned United States District Court Judge, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. section 636 (b)(1)(B) and Rule 304 of the Local Rules of Practice for the United States District Court, Eastern District of California. Within thirty (30) days after being served with a copy, any party may file written objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendation." Replies to the objections shall be served

1	and filed within fourteen (14) days after service of the objections. The Court will then review the	
2	Magistrate Judge's ruling pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(C). The parties are advised that	
3	failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District	
4	Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).	
5	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
6	Dated: <u>June 29, 2011</u>	/s/ Dennis L. Beck UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
7	,	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17	,	
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27	,	
28		