UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
LEROY ALLEN HELLER,	No. 2:17-cv-0042 CKD P
Petitioner,	
V.	ORDER
PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA.	
7 Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding pro se, has filed a petition for a writ of habeas	
8 corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. He has consented to have all matters in this action before a	
9 United States Magistrate Judge. <u>See</u> 28 U.S.C. § 636(c).	
Petitioner requests leave to proceed in forma pauperis. Examination of the in forma	
1 pauperis application reveals that petitioner is unable to afford the costs of suit. Accordingly, the	
application to proceed in forma pauperis will be granted. <u>See</u> 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a).	
Under Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, the court must review all	
4 petitions for writ of habeas corpus and summarily dismiss any petition if it is plain that the	
5 petitioner is not entitled to relief. The court has conducted that review.	
Petitioner challenges the amount of restitution he was ordered to pay when sentenced and	
the amount of credit he has been given agains	t that amount for time served in custody. However,
28 U.S.C. § 2254(a) is clear that the court can	only entertain a petition for writ of habeas corpus
	FOR THE EASTERN I LEROY ALLEN HELLER, Petitioner, v. PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, Respondent. Petitioner, a state prisoner proceeding corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. He has United States Magistrate Judge. See 28 U.S.C. Petitioner requests leave to proceed in pauperis application reveals that petitioner is application to proceed in forma pauperis will Under Rule 4 of the Rules Governing petitions for writ of habeas corpus and summar petitioner is not entitled to relief. The court h Petitioner challenges the amount of re- the amount of credit he has been given agains

1	brought by a state prisoner under § 2254 if there is an allegation that the prisoner is in custody in
2	violation of federal law. There is no habeas jurisdiction to hear claims brought by state prisoners
3	concerning an order that they pay restitution. <u>E.g. Bailey v. Hill</u> , 599 F.3d 976 (9th Cir. 2010).
4	For these reasons, IT IS HERBY ORDERED that:
5	1. Petitioner's request for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 6) is granted;
6	2. Petitioner's petition for writ of habeas corpus is summarily dismissed;
7	3. This case is closed; and
8	4. The court declines to issue the certificate of appealability referenced in 28 U.S.C. §
9	2253.
10	Dated: February 28, 2017 Carop U. Delany
11	CAROLYN K. DELANEY
12	UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
13	
14	
15	1 hell0042.sd
16	nento042.su
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	2
	2