19

20

21

22

23

24

26

27

28

1		
2		
3		
4		
5	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
6	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
7		
8	DENNIS HAMILTON,	No. C 10-4008 SI (pr)
9	Petitioner,	ORDER OF TRANSFER
10	v.	
11	F. GONZALEZ, warden,	
12	Respondent.	1
13		
14	Petitioner has filed a petition f	or writ of habeas corpus to challenge a parole deni
15	occurred at a hearing at the California Correctional Institution in Tehachapi, California,	
16	he currently is housed. Tehachapi is in Kern County, which is within the venue of the I	
17	District of California. Venue is proper in a habeas action in either the district of confir	
1.0		~

Petitioner has filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus to challenge a parole denial that occurred at a hearing at the California Correctional Institution in Tehachapi, California, where he currently is housed. Tehachapi is in Kern County, which is within the venue of the Eastern District of California. Venue is proper in a habeas action in either the district of confinement or the district of conviction, 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d); however, the district of confinement is the preferable forum to review the execution of a sentence, such as a parole denial claim. See Habeas L.R. 2254-3(a); Dunne v. Henman, 875 F.2d 244, 249 (9th Cir. 1989). Because petitioner is confined in the Eastern District of California and challenging the execution of his sentence, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1404(a) and Habeas L.R. 2254-3(b), and in the interests of justice, this action is TRANSFERRED to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California. The clerk shall transfer this matter forthwith.

25 IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: October 20, 2010

SUSAN ILLSTON United States District Judge