| 1 | | |
|----|--|--|
| 2 | | |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | | |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | ΙΙΝΙΤΨΕΓΟ ΟΨΑΨΕ | |
| 7 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA | |
| 8 | EASTERN DISTR | ICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | MARK CURTIS ORTEGA, | 1:12-cv-00070-AWI-SKO-HC |
| 11 | Petitioner, |) FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO DENY PETITIONER'S MOTION FOR AN |
| 12 | 77 |) DENI PEILIIONER'S MOTION FOR AN) ORDER GRANTING HIM ACCESS TO THE) LAW LIBRARY (DOC. 25) |
| 13 | V. |) |
| 14 | MARTIN BITER, Warden, | DEADLINE FOR OBJECTIONS: THIRTY (30) DAYS |
| 15 | Respondent. |) |
| 16 | ; | |
| | | |

17 Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a 18 petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The matter has been referred to the Magistrate Judge pursuant to 19 20 28 U.S.C.§ 636(b)(1) and Local Rules 72-302 and 72-303. Pending 21 before the Court is Petitioner's motion for an order directing 22 that Petitioner be granted access to the law library at Kern 23 Valley State Prison, where Petitioner is incarcerated, which was 24 filed on August 24, 2012. The Court understands Petitioner's 25 motion to constitute a motion for injunctive relief.

26 Petitioner states that there has been a lock down at the 27 prison where he is incarcerated and that the only way he is sure 28 that he will be able to gain access to the law library to prepare

1

1 a traverse is if this Court orders it. (Mot., doc. 25, 1.) The 2 Court notes that Petitioner was separately granted an extension 3 of time to file a traverse, and he subsequently filed a traverse 4 on September 24, 2012. After reviewing the request in its 5 entirety, the Court concludes that Petitioner is challenging the 6 conditions of his confinement, not the fact or duration of that 7 confinement.

8 It is established that relief by way of a writ of habeas 9 corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 extends to a prisoner who 10 demonstrates that the custody violates the Constitution, laws, or 11 treaties of the United States. 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(3).

12 A habeas corpus petition is the correct method for a 13 prisoner to challenge the legality or duration of his 14 confinement. Badea v. Cox, 931 F.2d 573, 574 (9th Cir. 1991) 15 (quoting <u>Preiser v. Rodriguez</u>, 411 U.S. 475, 485 (1973)); 16 Advisory Committee Note to Rule 1 of the Rules Governing Section 17 2254 Cases (Habeas Rules), 1976 Adoption. In contrast, a civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 is the proper method 18 19 for a prisoner to challenge the conditions of that confinement. 20 McCarthy v. Bronson, 500 U.S. 136, 141-42 (1991); Preiser, 411 21 U.S. at 499; Badea, 931 F.2d at 574; Advisory Committee Note to 22 Habeas Rule 1, 1976 adoption.

Because Petitioner seeks to challenge the conditions of his confinement, and not the legality or duration of his confinement, these particular claims are cognizable in a civil rights action rather than a petition for writ of habeas corpus. Accordingly, it will be recommended that the request for injunctive relief be denied.

2

IV. <u>Recommendation</u>

In accordance with the foregoing, it is RECOMMENDED that:

1

2

3

1) Petitioner's request for injunctive relief be DENIED.

4 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the 5 United States District Court Judge assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636 (b)(1)(B) and Rule 304 of 6 7 the Local Rules of Practice for the United States District Court, 8 Eastern District of California. Within thirty (30) days after 9 being served with a copy, any party may file written objections 10 with the Court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document 11 should be captioned "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings 12 and Recommendations." Replies to the objections shall be served 13 and filed within fourteen (14) days (plus three (3) days if 14 served by mail) after service of the objections. The Court will 15 then review the Magistrate Judge's ruling pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 16 636 (b) (1) (C). The parties are advised that failure to file 17 objections within the specified time may waive the right to 18 appeal the District Court's order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 19 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20

23

24

25

26

27

28

22 Dated: October 31, 2012

/s/ Sheila K. Oberto UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE