Smith v. Warden Doc. 6

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA HAMMOND DIVISION

| KEITH T. | SMITH,      | ) |           |                    |
|----------|-------------|---|-----------|--------------------|
|          | Petitioner, | ) |           |                    |
| v.       |             | ) | CAUSE NO. | 2:17-CV-328-RL-JEM |
| MADDENI  |             | ) |           |                    |
| WARDEN,  |             | ) |           |                    |
|          | Respondent. | ) |           |                    |

## OPINION AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on the: (1) 28 U.S.C. § 2254 Habeas Corpus Petition by a State Prisoner Challenging a Prison Disciplinary Proceeding, filed by Keith T. Smith, a prisoner without a lawyer, on August 4, 2017; and (2) Motion to Dismiss, filed by the Warden on October 25, 2017 (ECF 4). For the reasons set forth below, the motion to dismiss (ECF 4) is GRANTED and the Clerk is DIRECTED to close this case.

## BACKGROUND

Keith T. Smith filed this habeas corpus petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 challenging his loss of 30 days earned credit time. ECF 1. On May 4, 2017, in case number ISP 17-05-0006, a Disciplinary Hearing Officer ("DHO") at the Indiana State Prison found Smith guilty of Attempted Disorderly Conduct in violation of Indiana Department of Correction policies B-240/236. *Id*.

DISCUSSION

The Warden now moves to dismiss, asserting that after Smith

filed the petition, the finding of guilt and sanctions were

vacated. ECF 4, 4-2. Smith did not file a response and the time

for doing so has passed. See N.D. Ind. L. Cr. R. 47-2. Regardless,

the court cannot overturn the disciplinary proceeding and restore

his time because the Indiana Department of Correction has already

vacated the proceeding and restored his time. That is to say, Smith

has already won and there is no case left for this court to decide.

Accordingly, this case must be dismissed. See Hadley v. Holmes, 341

F.3d 661, 664 (7th Cir. 2003) (prisoner can challenge prison

disciplinary determination in habeas proceeding only when it

resulted in a sanction that lengthened the duration of his

confinement).

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the motion to dismiss (ECF 4)

is GRANTED and the Clerk is DIRECTED to close this case.

DATED: January 16, 2018

RUDY LOZANO, Judge

United States District Court

2