

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

MICHAEL E. SCHINKEL,

Petitioner,

No. CIV S-09-2247 DAD P

vs.

BOARD OF PAROLE HEARINGS,

Respondent.

ORDER

_____ /

Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Petitioner has paid the filing fee.

“A petitioner for habeas corpus relief must name the state officer having custody of him or her as the respondent to the petition.” Stanley v. California Supreme Court, 21 F.3d 359, 360 (9th Cir. 1994) (citing Rule 2(a), 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254). Petitioner has named the Board of Parole Hearings as the respondent in this action. The Board of Parole Hearings, however, is not the proper respondent. Accordingly, the instant petition must be dismissed with leave to amend. See Stanley, 21 F.3d at 360. Petitioner is advised that the proper respondent in the usual habeas action is the warden of the institution where the petitioner is currently incarcerated. See Stanley, 21 F.3d at 360.

////

1 In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

2 1. Petitioner’s motion to proceed in forma pauperis (Doc. No. 2) is denied as
3 moot;

4 2. Petitioner’s application for writ of habeas corpus is dismissed with leave to file
5 an amended petition within thirty days from the date of this order;

6 3. Any amended petition must be filed on the form employed by this court, must
7 name the proper respondent, and must state all claims and prayers for relief on the form. It must
8 bear the case number assigned to this action and must bear the title “Amended Petition”; and

9 4. The Clerk of the Court is directed to send petitioner the form for habeas corpus
10 application.

11 DATED: September 11, 2009.

12 
13 _____
14 DALE A. DROZD
15 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

16 DAD:9
17 schi2247.122
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26