

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

GREGORY S. TAYLOR,

\*

Petitioner,

\*

v.

\*

Civil Action No. RWT-11-1748

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

\*

Respondent.

\*

\*\*\*

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

On June 22, 2011, correspondence was received from Petitioner stating his desire to file a Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus. ECF No. 1. Petitioner again claims his confinement is unlawful based on several theories including: (1) he was entitled to a jury trial, but did not receive one because he pled guilty; (2) a detainer lodged against him has increased his “points,” making his security status “high” instead of “medium”; and (3) a two-point sentencing enhancement was given because of obstruction charges which were based on “filings that happened after.” ECF No. 1. Petitioner filed a similar claim on June 2, 2011. See Taylor v. United States of America, Civil Action No. RWT-11-1501 (D. Md. 2011). That petition was dismissed for the same reasons the instant petition is subject to dismissal. Those reasons are set forth below.

To the extent Petitioner is asserting a claim regarding the legality of the sentencing proceeding in his criminal case, the correspondence is in the nature of a motion to vacate filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2255. Petitioner currently has an appeal pending with the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals and relief pursuant to a motion to vacate is not available at this time. *See Rules Governing § 2255 Proceedings*, Rule 5, advisory committee note; *see also United States v. Cook*,

