| 1  |  |   |
|----|--|---|
| 2  |  |   |
| 3  |  |   |
| 4  |  |   |
| 5  |  |   |
| 6  |  |   |
| 7  |  |   |
| 8  | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT   |   |
| 9  | FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA   |   |
| 10 |  |   |
| 11 | FRANCISCO MERINO,  | No. 2:21-cv-2112-EFB P                                |
| 12 | Petitioner,  |   |
| 13 | V.   | ORDER AND FINDINGS AND                                |
| 14 | C S PRISON - SACRAMENTO,   | RECOMMENDATIONS                                       |
| 15 | Respondent.  |   |
| 16 |  |   |
| 17 | Petitioner is a state prisoner without co  | ounsel seeking a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to    |
| 18 | 28 U.S.C. § 2254. <sup>1</sup> The petition does not chal  | lenge petitioner's underlying conviction. Instead, it |
| 19 | "concerns conditions of confinement," specifically, plaintiff's claim that he should be moved to a |   |
| 20 | less violent yard. ECF No. 1 at 4-5. As discussed below, the court will recommend that the         |   |
| 21 | petition be dismissed. See Rule 4, Rules Gove  | erning § 2254 Cases (requiring summary dismissal      |
| 22 | of habeas petition if, upon initial review by a j  | udge, it plainly appears "that the petitioner is not  |
| 23 | entitled to relief in the district court").  |   |
| 24 | Federal courts offer two main avenues  | to relief on complaints related to one's              |
| 25 | imprisonment – a petition for habeas corpus p  | ursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, and a civil rights       |
| 26 | complaint pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Chal   | llenges to the validity of one's confinement or the   |
| 27 |  |   |
| 28 | granted.   | in forma pauperis. ECF No. 2. That request is         |
|    |  |   |
|    |  |   |

| 1  | duration of one's confinement are properly brought in a habeas action, whereas requests for relief     |  |
|----|--|--|
| 2  | turning on the circumstances of one's confinement are properly brought in a § 1983 action.             |  |
| 3  | Muhammad v. Close, 540 U.S. 749, 750 (2004) (citing Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475, 500            |  |
| 4  | (1973)); see also 28 U.S.C. § 2254(a) ("[A] district court shall entertain an application for a writ   |  |
| 5  | of habeas corpus in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only       |  |
| 6  | on the ground that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United |  |
| 7  | States."); Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 1 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases.                     |  |
| 8  | Because petitioner is challenging the conditions of his confinement as opposed to the                  |  |
| 9  | legality or duration of his confinement, his claims are not cognizable in this federal habeas action   |  |
| 10 | and must be dismissed.   |  |
| 11 | Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:   |  |
| 12 | 1. Petitioner's application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 2) is                      |  |
| 13 | GRANTED.   |  |
| 14 | 2. The Clerk of Court shall send to petitioner a blank civil rights complaint form in order            |  |
| 15 | for petitioner to file a new civil rights action should he so choose.                                  |  |
| 16 | 3. The Clerk of the Court shall randomly assign a United States District Judge to this                 |  |
| 17 | action.  |  |
| 18 | Further, IT IS RECOMMENDED that petitioner's application for a writ of habeas corpus                   |  |
| 19 | be denied without prejudice to filing his claims in a new action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.               |  |
| 20 | These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge                   |  |
| 21 | assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days        |  |
| 22 | after being served with these findings and recommendations, any party may file written                 |  |
| 23 | objections with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned         |  |
| 24 | "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and Recommendations." Failure to file objections            |  |
| 25 | within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District Court's order. Turner v.          |  |
| 26 | Duncan, 158 F.3d 449, 455 (9th Cir. 1998); Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991). In         |  |
| 27 | his objections petitioner may address whether a certificate of appealability should issue in the       |  |
| 28 | event he files an appeal of the judgment in this case. See Rule 11, Rules Governing § 2254 Cases       |  |
|    | 2  |  |

| 1  | (the district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order |
|----|--|
| 2  | adverse to the applicant).   |
| 3  | Dated: December 10, 2021.  |
| 4  | EDMUND F. BRENNAN<br>UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE  |
| 5  | UNITED STATES MADISTRATE JUDDE   |
| 6  |  |
| 7  |  |
| 8  |  |
| 9  |  |
| 10 |  |
| 11 |  |
| 12 |  |
| 13 |  |
| 14 |  |
| 15 |  |
| 16 |  |
| 17 |  |
| 18 |  |
| 19 |  |
| 20 |  |
| 21 |  |
| 22 |  |
| 23 |  |
| 24 |  |
| 25 |  |
| 26 |  |
| 27 |  |
| 28 |  |
|    | 3  |