

1

2

3

4

5

6

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

7

8

9

FREDERICK BANKS,

10

Petitioner,

Case No. 2:16-cv-01151-GMN-NJK

11

vs.

**ORDER**

12

MARK HORNAK, et al.,

13

Respondents.

14

15

Petitioner is in custody at FCI Butner, in North Carolina.<sup>1</sup> He has filed an application to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No.1) and a petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The court will dismiss this action.

16

17

18

If petitioner is not attacking his sentence, then the correct respondent is the warden of the prison where petitioner is held. 28 U.S.C. § 2242. The correct district court in which petitioner should file the petition is the district court where the warden is located. 28 U.S.C. § 2241(a). In this case, it would be the United States District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina. If the petition could be construed as a motion attacking petitioner's sentence, then petitioner would need to file the motion in the court where he was convicted. 28 U.S.C. § 2255(a). Based upon the name of the first respondent, the Honorable Mark Hornak, that court would be the United States District Court for the Western District of Pennsylvania.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

---

<sup>1</sup>The court obtained that information on-line. Petitioner has given his address as the offices of the Federal Bureau of Prisons in Washington, DC.

1 The court will not transfer this action to either of those two courts. First, the petition is so  
2 vague that the court cannot determine whether it should be a petition under § 2241 or a motion  
3 under § 2255, and thus the court cannot determine which court would be the correct court. Second,  
4 even if it was clear which court was the correct court, it still would not be in the interests of justice  
5 to transfer a vague petition to that court. Petitioner needs to compose a clear, concise petition or  
6 motion and file it in that court.


7 Reasonable jurists would not find the court's conclusions to be debatable or wrong, and the  
8 court will not issue a certificate of appealability.

9 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the application to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No.  
10 1) is **DENIED**.

11 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that this action is **DISMISSED**. The clerk of the court shall  
12 enter judgment accordingly and close this action.

13 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a certificate of appealability is **DENIED**.

14 DATED: [May 25, 2016](#)

15  
16  
17   
18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 Gloria M. Navarro, Chief Judge  
20 United States District Court  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28