

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF PUERTO RICO**

RAFAEL COLLAZO-APONTE

Petitioner

v.

Civil No. 11-1031 (SEC)

JERRY C. MARTINEZ

Respondent

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

OPINION AND ORDER

Before the Court are pro se petitioner Rafael Collazo-Aponte's application for a writ of habeas corpus (Docket # 3) pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241 (the "Petition"), and the Government's unopposed motion to dismiss. Docket # 7. After reviewing the filings, and the applicable law, the Government's motion is **GRANTED**.

Factual and Procedural Background

On June 4, 1998, the District Court of Puerto Rico sentenced Collazo to a total imprisonment term of two-hundred and seventy-one (271) months for Conspiracy to Possess an Excess of 50 grams of Cocaine Base in violation of 21 U.S.C. §846,841(a) (1); and Unlawful Use of a Firearm during and in Relation to a Drug Trafficking Offense, in violation of 18 U.S.C. §924(c)(1). See Crim. No. 95-29-47. On March 27, 2010, however, the court amended Collazo's judgment, and changed the term of incarceration to two-hundred and eleven 211 months. Id. Collazo, who is currently incarcerated in the Metropolitan Detention Center ("MDC") in Guaynabo, Puerto Rico, has a projected release date of October 13, 2012. Docket # 3, p. 1.

Because Collazo's whole Petition relates to the Second Chance Act of 2007, Pub. L. 110-199, 122 Stat. 657 (the "SCA"), a brief introduction to this recent federal law is convenient. The SCA changed, among other things, the way the Bureau of Prisons ("BOP") makes pre-release Residential Re-Entry Center ("RRC) placement decisions. See generally id. In jargon,

2
3 RRC is a halfway house that aids a prisoner transition into society. See Black's Law Dictionary
4 1424 (9th ed. 2009). As relevant here, the SCA amended 18 USCA § 3624(c); it now reads as
5 follows:

6 The Director of the BOP shall, to the extent practicable, ensure that a
7 prisoner serving a term of imprisonment spends a portion of the final
8 months of that term (not to exceed 12 months), under conditions that will
9 afford that prisoner a reasonable opportunity to adjust to and prepare for the
10 reentry of that prisoner into the community. Such conditions may include
11 a community correctional facility.

12 Because Collazo provides no factual support in support of his contentions, the Court has
13 no option but to draw its narrative from the Government's well-sustained chronology.¹ On
14 March 9, 2011, MDC Case Manager Maria Rodriguez assessed Collazo's pre-release RRC
15 placement. According to Rodriguez's declaration under penalty of perjury, based on a
16 individualized opinion of Collazo, she made a recommendation of "[g]reater than (>) two-
17 hundred and seventy (270) days of RRC placement." Docket # 7-3, Exh. C. In other words, out
18 of a statutory maximum of twelve months, Rodriguez recommended nine. On or around August,
19 2011, the Community Corrections Management office ("CCM") reduced Rodriguez's
20 recommendation to one-hundred and eighty (180) days. See Docket # 7, p. 3. On August 17,
21 2011, Collazo was officially informed of this determination.

22 Puzzlingly, Collazo filed the Petition on January 13, 2011, two months before
23 Rodriguez's assessment. Notwithstanding this red flag, Collazo challenges his RRC placement:
24 the BOP's decision to allow him to be transferred to RRC for a period of less than twelve
25 months. See generally Docket # 3. Collazo essentially requests that this Court order the BOP
26 to send him to a RRC for twelve months, as opposed to six. Id.

27 The Government contends that because Collazo failed to exhaust the BOP
28 Administrative Remedies Procedures, the Court should dismiss the Petition. Docket # 7, p. 4.

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

¹As discussed below, Collazo's lack of factual averments most likely has to do with the Petition being a literal copy of another § 2241 petition filed elsewhere.

2
3 Alternatively, the Government posits that the Petition is moot. Id., p. 18. Collazo admits not
4 having filed any administrative remedies request under the BOP's Administrative Remedies
5 Procedures. See Docket # 7-4, Exh. D.

6 **Standard of Review**

7 28 U.S.C. § 2241 is the appropriate vehicle for challenging BOP regulations. See Muniz
8 v. Sabol, 517 F.3d 29, 34 (1st Cir. 2008). Prisoners seeking such relief, however, are subject to
9 administrative exhaustion requirements. Skinner v. Wiley, 355 F.3d 1293, 1294–95 (11th Cir.
10 2004); De La Cova Y Gonzalez Abreu v. United States, 611 F.Supp. 137, 139 (D.P.R. 1985).
11 Furthermore, the petitioner bears the burden of establishing, by a preponderance of the
12 evidence, that he is entitled to relief. United States v. DiCarlo, 575 F.2d 952, 954 (1st Cir.
13 1978).

14 **Applicable Law and Analysis**

15 As previously noted, Collazo concedes that he failed to exhaust any administrative
16 remedies prior to filing the Petition. However, Collazo advances a plethora of arguments to
17 justify his omission. Unfortunately for Collazo, this Court finds that the Petition appears to be
18 a “copy-paste” of a § 2241 petition filed last year in the District Court of Hawaii. See Pasion
19 v. McGrew, No. 10-0044, WL 3184518 (D. Hawai‘i. 2010). The Court is persuaded by its sister
20 court’s analysis rejecting identical and unavailing contentions:

21 When it passed the [SCA], Congress expressly stated that “[n]othing in
22 this Act or an amendment made by this Act shall be construed as creating
23 a right or entitlement to assistance or services for any individual,
24 program, or grant recipient.” 42 U.S.C. § 17504. A plain reading of §
25 3624(c)(1), as amended by the Act, reveals that while the BOP Director
26 must ensure that an inmate spends “a portion” of the final months of his
sentence in a community correctional facility or RRC, the Director has
the discretion to set the time period which may “not exceed 12 months.”
The twelve-month time period is a maximum time limit-the BOP
Director is not required to place a prisoner in an RRC for 12 months.

WL 3184518, at *3.

2
3 In other words, the SCA did not confer prisoners with a statutory right to twelve months
4 in RRC. The SCA does require, however, that inmates be individually considered for placement
5 in an RRC based on the following five factors:

- 6 (1) the resources of the facility contemplated;
- 7 (2) the nature and circumstances of the offense;
- 8 (3) the history and characteristics of the prisoner;
- 9 (4) any statement by the court that imposed the sentence; and
- 10 (5) any pertinent policy statement issued by the U.S. Sentencing
11 Commission.

12 18 U.S.C. § 3621(b).

13 As in Pasion, Collazo offers no evidence that he was improperly evaluated for RRC
14 eligibility. On the contrary, Rodriguez’s affidavit clearly attests that Collazo was individually
15 reviewed and evaluated pursuant to the foregoing factors. Docket #7, p. 17. Moreover,
16 Collazo’s requests are merely a *verbatim* recitation of the rejected petition in Pasion: that this
17 Court order “the BOP in good faith to consider Petitioner on an individualized basis using the
18 five factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. § 3621(b).” Docket #3, p. 25. Such a request is patently
19 insufficient for habeas relief. See Miller v. Whitehead, 527 F.3d 752, 757-58 (8th Cir. 2008).
20 Because Collazo’s imprisonment does not violate the law, the Petition is denied.

21 **Conclusion**

22 Based on the foregoing, Collazo’s Section 2254 petition is **DENIED**, and the instant case
23 is **DISMISSED with prejudice**.

24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25 In San Juan, Puerto Rico, this 19th day of December, 2011.

26
S/Salvador E. Casellas
SALVADOR E. CASELLAS
U.S. Senior District Judge