

of exercising personal jurisdiction over his warden. *See Stokes v. U.S. Parole Com'n*, 374 F.3d 1235, 1239 (D.C. Cir. 2004) (“[A] district court may not entertain a habeas petition involving present physical custody unless the respondent custodian is within its territorial jurisdiction.”); *Rooney v. Sec’y of Army*, 405 F.3d 1029, 1032 (D.C. Cir. 2005) (habeas “jurisdiction is proper only in the district in which the immediate . . . custodian is located”) (internal citations and quotation marks omitted).

Because petitioner has no recourse in this Court under any of the applicable habeas provisions, this action will be dismissed. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

DATE: January 13, 2015


United States District Judge