1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	MARCUS E. THREATS,	Civil No. 09-0816 IEG (AJB)
12	Petitioner,	ORDER SUA SPONTE SUBSTITUTING
13	v.	RESPONDENT
14	D. K. SISTO, Warden, et al.,	
15	Respondent.	
16	At the time of filing, Petitioner was apparently housed at California State Prison, Solano	
17	and thus named D. K. Sisto, Warden, and subsequently, J. W. Haviland, Warden, as	
18	Respondents. Based on the notice of change of address Petitioner submitted to the Court on June	
19	22, 2009 [return address on a letter dated June 13, 2009 from Petitioner to the Court], it appears	
20	Petitioner is no longer housed at California State Prison, Solano; rather, it appears he is presently	
21	incarcerated at the Correctional Training Facility in Soledad, California.	
22	A writ of habeas corpus acts upon the custodian of the state prisoner. See 28 U.S.C.	
23	§ 2242; Rule 2(a), 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254. Because Petitioner's place of custody has changed,	
24	so has his custodian. Accordingly, in order to conform with the requirements of Rule 2(a) of the	
25	Rules Governing § 2254 Cases and to avoid changing the Respondent again if Petitioner is	
26	transferred to another prison or paroled, the Court hereby sua sponte <b>ORDERS</b> the substitution	
27	of Matthew Cate, Secretary of the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, as	
28	Respondent in place of "D. K. Sisto" and "J. W	V. Haviland." See Ortiz-Sandoval v. Gomez, 81

K:\COMMON\BATTAGLI\CASES\2 Orders to be filed\09cv0816 sub resp.wpd, 6299

F.3d 891, 894 (9th Cir. 1996) (stating that the respondent in § 2254 proceedings may be the chief
officer in charge of state penal institutions).

3	Additionally, Jerry Brown, the Attorney General of the State of California, is not a proper	
4	respondent in this action. Rule 2 of the Rules following § 2254 provides that the state officer	
5	having custody of the petitioner shall be named as respondent. Rule 2(a), 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254.	
6	However, "if the applicant is not presently in custody pursuant to a state judgement against	
7	which he seeks relief but may be subject to such custody in the future," then "the officer having	
8	present custody of the applicant as well as the attorney general of the state in which the judgment	
9	which he seeks to attack was entered shall each be named as respondents." Rule 2 (b), 28 U.S.C.	
10	foll. § 2254. Here, there is no basis for Petitioner to have named the Attorney General as a	
11	respondent in this action.	
12	The Clerk of the Court shall modify the docket to reflect "Matthew Cate, Secretary" as	
13	respondent in place of "D. K. Sisto" and "J. K. Haviland."	
14	IT IS SO ORDERED.	
15	DATED: June 29, 2009	
16		
17		
18	2 Sattachio	
19	Hon. Anthony J. Battaglia U.S. Magistrate Judge	
20	United States District Court	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	KACOMMON\BATTAGLICASES\2 Orders to be filed09ev0816 sub resp. wpd, 6299 -2-	