

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PETER T. EDELBACHER,

Petitioner,

v.

CALIFORNIA BOARD OF PAROLE
HEARINGS,

Respondent.

Case No. 1:17-cv-00636-AWI-SAB-HC

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION TO
CONVERT PETITION FOR WRIT OF
HABEAS CORPUS TO CIVIL RIGHTS
ACTION UNDER 42 U.S.C. § 1983

Petitioner is a state prisoner proceeding pro se with a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

I.

BACKGROUND

Petitioner is currently in the custody of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. On January 10, 2017, Petitioner filed the instant petition for writ of habeas corpus in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. (ECF No. 1). On May 4, 2017, the petition was transferred to this Court. (ECF No. 9). In the petition, Petitioner is challenging the Board of Parole Hearings (“Board”) denying him consideration for release under the Elder Parole Program. (ECF No. 1 at 5).¹

¹ Page numbers refer to the ECF page numbers stamped at the top of the page.

1 **II.**

2 **DISCUSSION**

3 Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases requires preliminary review of a
4 habeas petition and allows a district court to dismiss a petition before the respondent is ordered
5 to file a response if it “plainly appears from the petition and any attached exhibits that the
6 petitioner is not entitled to relief in the district court.”

7 **A. Federal Habeas Jurisdiction**

8 By statute, federal courts “shall entertain an application for a writ of habeas corpus in
9 behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he
10 is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States.” 28 U.S.C.
11 § 2254(a). A claim falls within the “core of habeas corpus” when a prisoner challenges “the fact
12 or duration of his confinement” and “seeks either immediate release from that confinement or the
13 shortening of its duration.” Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475, 489 (1973). The Ninth Circuit
14 has adopted a rule that a “state prisoner’s claim [that] does not lie at ‘the core of habeas corpus’
15 . . . must be brought, ‘if at all,’ under § 1983.” Nettles v. Grounds, 830 F.3d 922, 934 (9th Cir.
16 2016) (en banc) (quoting Preiser, 411 U.S. at 487; Skinner v. Switzer, 562 U.S. 521, 535 n.13
17 (2011)). Therefore, if “success on [Petitioner]’s claims would not necessarily lead to his
18 immediate or earlier release from confinement, [Petitioner]’s claim does not fall within ‘the core
19 of habeas corpus,’ and he must instead bring his claim under § 1983.” Nettles, 830 F.3d at 935
20 (quoting Skinner, 562 U.S at 535 n.13).

21 Here, Petitioner asserts that the Board improperly denied Petitioner consideration for
22 release under the Elder Parole Program and appears to be seeking a court order for the Board to
23 schedule and hold a parole suitability hearing. (ECF No. 1 at 5, 19). However, success on
24 Petitioner’s claim would not necessarily lead to his immediate or earlier release from
25 confinement. See Nettles, 830 F.3d at 935 (noting that under California law, the parole board
26 must consider all relevant reliable information in determining suitability for parole and has the
27 authority to deny parole on the basis of any grounds presently available to it). Based on the
28 foregoing, Petitioner’s claim is not cognizable in federal habeas corpus.

1 Within **THIRTY (30) days** after service of the Findings and Recommendation, Petitioner may
2 file written objections with the Court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be
3 captioned “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendation.” The assigned
4 District Judge will then review the Magistrate Judge’s ruling pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
5 § 636(b)(1)(C). Petitioner is advised that failure to file objections within the specified time may
6 result in the waiver of rights on appeal. Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014)
7 (citing Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)).

8
9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: June 5, 2017


UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28