

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DELBERT WILLIAMS,

Petitioner,

No. CIV S-06-2302 LKK CMK P

vs.

Unknown,¹

Respondent.

ORDER

Petitioner filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus on October 18, 2006. Petitioner attached to the petition is “exhibit 3,” which petitioner describes as “mystery meat” and “mysterious MFG Lunch meats...” (Pet., Ex. 3.) Petitioner requests that the court send the mystery meat for a laboratory determination.

Petitioner is informed that there is no need for a lunch meat exhibit in a habeas action. (See Badea v. Cox, 931 F.2d 573, 574 (9th Cir.1991) (habeas corpus petition is proper method to challenge legality or duration of confinement, but civil rights action is proper method of challenging conditions of confinement)). Further, the court is not a repository for maintaining perishable exhibits, nor does the court send items for laboratory testing.


///

¹Petitioner has failed to name a respondent in his habeas application. He lists the respondents as “etc. and All.”

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

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED THAT exhibit 3, which petitioner refers to as
mystery lunch meat, shall be disregarded and returned to petitioner.

DATED: October 18, 2006.


CRAIG M. KELLISON
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

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