

1 classification are not cognizable by way of a § 2241 action, however. *See, e.g., Strausbaugh v.*
2 *Shartle*, CV-15-398-TUC-JAS (JR), 2017 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 55900, *9 (D. Ariz. April 11, 2017)
3 (“Claims that merely challenge a petitioner’s classification by the BOP without potentially
4 shortening the petitioner’s sentence are not cognizable in a federal habeas petition.”); *Parada v.*
5 *Martinez*, No. CV 19-4405 JAK (MRW), 2019 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 163574, *4-5 (C.D. Cal. Sept.
6 24, 2019) (“[T]he Court cannot adjudicate Petitioner's contention that the BOP has misclassified
7 him for prison housing or program purposes. A challenge to the conditions of his confinement
8 rather than the legality of his confinement [] is not cognizable on habeas corpus review.”)
9 (internal quotation marks omitted). The matter might be different if this classification were
10 potentially to impact the length of petitioner’s sentence, but the petition does not, as best as I can
11 tell, indicate that this is the case.

12 Petitioner may, if he chooses, file an amended petition that addresses this deficiency. If
13 he does not, I will recommend that this action be dismissed.


14 It is ORDERED that:

15 1. Petitioner may file an amended § 2241 petition within thirty days of this order’s
16 entry. If he does not, I will recommend that the current petition be dismissed for the reasons
17 stated in this order.

18 2. The Clerk of Court is directed to send petitioner a federal § 2241 habeas form with
19 this order.

20
21 IT IS SO ORDERED.

22 Dated: January 13, 2023

23 
24 JEREMY D. PETERSON
25 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE
26
27
28