Page 1 of 2

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

Civil Action No. PJM-06-0266 JERRY MACK DORROUGH

Related Civil Action No. PJM-06-0053

Petitioner

v.

UNITED STATES PAROLE COMM'N

Respondent

000000

## MEMORANDUM OPINION

Pending are a pro se 28 U.S.C. § 2241 Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus and a motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis filed on January 31, 2006, by Jerry Mack Dorrough, a prisoner confined in the Smith County Jail in Tyler, Texas. Petitioner challenges his confinement pending revocation of his parole.<sup>2</sup> The matter will be transferred to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas.

Courts may grant a writ of habeas corpus "within their respective jurisdictions." 28 U.S.C. § 2241(a). In a § 2241 action, the petition must be filed in the district court of the district where petitioner is in custody. See Braden v. 30th Judicial Circuit, 410 U.S. 484, 495-500 (1973). In this

It does not appear that Petitioner was convicted of any offenses before this Court. In 1963, Jerry Mack Dorrough pleaded guilty in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas to robbery of a postal employee and putting the life of a postal employee in jeopardy during a robbery. See United States v. Dorrough, 3:63-cr-00125-1 (D. Tx.). After his release on parole in November of 1978, he fled and eluded authorities until his arrest in May of 1999. See U.S. v. Dorrough 101 Fed. Appx. 974, 975 (5th Cir. 2004) (unpublished). It appears that Petitioner has completed his term of incarceration but remains under the supervision of the United States Parole Commission.

Petitioner presents essentially the same claims here as those raised in his previous application for writ of habeas corpus. See Dorrough v. United States Parole Comm'n, Civil Action PJM-06-0053 (D. Md).

case, Petitioner is in the custody of the Warden at the Smith County Jail in Tyler, Texas. That facility is located within the judicial district of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas. Consequently, this matter will be transferred to that court for all proceedings that may be appropriate.<sup>3</sup> A separate order follows.

February 6, 2006

PETER J. MESSITTE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

that the foregoing document is a full, true and correct copy of the original on file in my office and n averaged custody.

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

C. Mulquen Deputy

The Court will not rule on the motion to proceed in forma pauperis so that the transferee court may examine and rule on it in accordance with that court's local practice.