| 1  |  |                        |
|----|--|------------------------|
| 2  |  |                        |
| 3  |  |                        |
| 4  |  |                        |
| 5  |  |                        |
| 6  |  |                        |
| 7  |  |                        |
| 8  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT   |                        |
| 9  | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA   |                        |
| 10 |  |                        |
| 11 | ROBERT BARKER,   | No. 2:18-cv-1661-EFB P |
| 12 | Petitioner,  |                        |
| 13 | V.   | <u>ORDER</u>           |
| 14 | S. HATTON, Warden,   |                        |
| 15 | Respondent.  |                        |
| 16 |  |                        |
| 17 | Petitioner is a state prisoner without counsel seeking a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to         |                        |
| 18 | 28 U.S.C. § 2254. He challenges the October 14, 2015 decision of the California Board of Parole    |                        |
| 19 | Hearings to deny him parole. See ECF No. 1. Consequently, the instant petition is one for review   |                        |
| 20 | of the execution of a sentence imposed by a California state court. See Rosas v. Nielsen, 428 F.3d |                        |
| 21 | 1229, 1232 (9th Cir. 2005) (denial of parole is "a decision 'regarding the execution' of" a prison |                        |
| 22 | sentence.) As a general rule, "[t]he proper forum to challenge the execution of a sentence is the  |                        |
| 23 | district where the prisoner is confined." Dunne v. Henman, 875 F.2d 244, 249 (9th Cir. 1989).      |                        |
| 24 | Petitioner is incarcerated at the Correctional Training Facility in the County of Monterey, which  |                        |
| 25 | lies in the Northern District of California. See 28 U.S.C. § 84(a).                                |                        |
| 26 | Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d), courts in both the district of conviction and the district of     |                        |
| 27 | confinement have concurrent jurisdiction over applications for habeas corpus filed by state        |                        |
| 28 | prisoners. While petitioner was convicted in the Los Angeles County Superior Court in the          |                        |

| 1        | Central District of California, the proper forum for the instant challenge is in the district of    |  |
|----------|---|--|
| 2        | confinement. In the interest of justice, this court may transfer this action "to any other district |  |
| 3        | where it might have been brought." 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a). Therefore, in the interest of justice, this |  |
| 4        | action will be transferred to the United States District Court for the Northern District of         |  |
| 5        | California.   |  |
| 6        | In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to               |  |
| 7        | the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d); 28   |  |
| 8        | U.S.C. § 1406(a).   |  |
| 9        | DATED: June 13, 2018.   |  |
| 10       | UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  |  |
| 11       |   |  |
| 12       |   |  |
| 13       |   |  |
| 14       |   |  |
| 15       |   |  |
| 16<br>17 |   |  |
| 17<br>18 |   |  |
| 18<br>19 |   |  |
| 20       |   |  |
| 20       |   |  |
| 22       |   |  |
| 23       |   |  |
| 24       |   |  |
| 25       |   |  |
| 26       |   |  |
| 27       |   |  |
| 28       |   |  |
|          | 2   |  |