

States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Maryland committed acts of misconduct. *See generally* Pet. Petitioner demands his immediate release.² *See id.* at 7. Challenges of this nature must be presented to the sentencing court in a motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255. *See Morrison v. Guzik*, Nos. 97-6351, 97-6416, 1998 WL 380539, at *2 (10th Cir. June 30, 1998) (concluding that a habeas petition asserting a “claim . . . ultimately predicated on his contention that the trial court erred when it imposed a sentence that exceeded the statutory maximum” is properly brought before the sentencing court by a § 2255 motion); *Ojo v. Immigration & Naturalization Serv.*, 106 F.3d 680, 683 (5th Cir. 1997) (finding that a motion under § 2255 “is the proper means of attacking errors that occurred during or before sentencing”); *Lopez v. Mukasey*, No. 08-0717, 2008 WL 1985232, at *1 (D.D.C. May 5, 2008) (dismissing petition for lack of jurisdiction “[b]ecause petitioner is challenging his conviction, [and] his recourse lies in a motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255” before the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas).

Section 2255 provides specifically that:

[a] prisoner in custody under sentence of a court established by Act of Congress claiming the right to be released upon the ground that the sentence was imposed in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States, or that the court was without jurisdiction to impose such sentence, or that the sentence was in excess of the maximum authorized by law, or is otherwise subject to collateral attack, *may move the court which imposed the sentence to vacate, set aside or correct the sentence.*

28 U.S.C. § 2255(a) (emphasis added). Moreover, the opportunity to challenge a conviction by a motion to vacate the sentence generally precludes a challenge by means of a petition for habeas corpus:

² According to the Federal Bureau of Prisons’ Inmate Locator, petitioner’s projected release date is August 30, 2009.

