

United States District Court For the Northern District of California could not comply with that order because petitioner was before this court on a writ of *habeas corpus ad prosecundum* from the State of California and had to be returned to its jurisdiction. While this
 may have been a failure to comply with the court's order and its intentions, it was not a breach of the
 plea agreement because no such promise or representation is contained in the plea agreement.<sup>1</sup>

The court notes that petitioner certainly got better than he bargained for which was a 13-year sentence on the count in this action. At the same time that he entered a plea to this action petitioner also pled guilty to a count in CR-00-0031 MHP, which charged a violation of 18 U.S.C. section 924(c). That count required a five (5) year consecutive sentence. The plea agreement covered both of these cases and petitioner agreed in that agreement to a consecutive term of five years for a total sentence of 18 years. However, at the time of sentencing this court recalculated the guidelines applicable to petitioner and sentenced him on this action to a term of ninety (90) months with a consecutive term of five (5) years on the second case.

The court also notes that petitioner was ably represented by a very experienced criminal
defense lawyer as shown by the results that counsel argued for and received in the reduction of the
proposed sentence.

As explained above, there was no promise of the nature petitioner claims was breached. The plea agreement is silent on the subject of where petitioner would serve his sentence. It was only agreed that it would be concurrent. The most he could hope for in that respect was that the court would recommend that he remain in federal custody to serve his sentence. The court and the prosecutor acted favorably to petitioner. However, the State authorities and the Bureau of Prisons could not comply. Despite the failure to comply with the court's order, there was no breach of the plea agreement. Therefore, the petition for a writ of habeas corpus is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

25 Date: February 2, 2011

MARILYN HALL PATEL United States District Court Judge

United States District Court For the Northern District of California 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

23

24

26

27

28

