

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF INDIANA

MARTIN CALDWELL,)
Petitioner,)
v.) No. 2:10-cv-141-WTL-TAB
B.R. JETT,)
Respondent.)

Entry Directing Further Proceedings

I.

The Attorney General of the United States is **stricken** as a respondent because the only proper respondent in this action is the petitioner's custodian.

II.

Petitioner Caldwell is confined within this District and seeks a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(3). He challenges the validity of his conviction entered in the Northern District of Illinois.

The petitioner may have an uphill path to travel in demonstrating that a remedy via § 2241(c)(3) should be available to him. And it is his burden to show that such a remedy is the proper one. *Jeffers v. Chandler*, 253 F.3d 827, 830 (5th Cir. 2001); *Charles v. Chandler*, 180 F.3d 753, 756 (6th Cir. 1999).

A writ of habeas corpus via § 2241 may be utilized by a federal prisoner to challenge the legality of his or her conviction or sentence in those cases where § 2255 is "inadequate or ineffective to test the legality of [the] detention." 28 U.S.C. § 2255(e). A remedy via § 2255 is "inadequate" when its provisions limiting multiple § 2255 motions prevent a prisoner from obtaining review of a legal theory that "establishes the petitioner's actual innocence." *Taylor v. Gilkey*, 314 F.3d 832, 835 (7th Cir. 2002).

On the basis of the foregoing, therefore, the petitioner shall have **through June 17, 2010**, in which to **show cause** why this action can proceed under § 2241 or why, in the alternative, it should not be transferred to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: 05/27/2010

William T. Lawrence

Hon. William T. Lawrence, Judge
United States District Court
Southern District of Indiana

Distribution:

Martin Caldwell
No. 21375-424
Federal Correctional Institution
P.O. Box 33
Terre Haute, IN 47808