

1  
2  
3 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
4 EASTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON

5 FRANK R. GOLDSMITH,

6 Petitioner,

7 vs.

8 STATE OF WASHINGTON,

9 Respondent.

NO. CV-07-179-JLQ

ORDER DISMISSING ACTION

10  
11 BEFORE THE COURT is what appears to be a copy of a habeas corpus petition  
12 Mr. Goldsmith has attempted to pursue in the Spokane County Superior Court (Ct. Rec.  
13 1). This document does not contain an original signature as required by Rule 11, Federal  
14 Rules of Civil Procedure. It also fails to name a proper Respondent under Rule 2(a),  
15 Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts.

16 A petitioner for federal habeas corpus relief must name the state officer having  
17 custody of him or her as the respondent to the petition. *Stanley v. California Supreme*  
18 *Court*, 21 F.3d 359, 360 (9th Cir. 1994). This person typically is the warden of the  
19 facility in which the petitioner is incarcerated. *Brittingham v. United States*, 982 F.2d  
20 378, 379 (9th Cir. 1992). Failure to name the petitioner's custodian as a respondent  
21 deprives federal courts of personal jurisdiction. *Id.*; *Dunne v. Henman*, 875 F.2d 244,  
22 249 (9th Cir.1989).

23 In a letter accompanying his Petition, Mr. Goldsmith asks the federal court to  
24 intervene on his behalf in the state court. Generally, federal courts will not intervene in a  
25 pending state court criminal proceeding absent extraordinary circumstances. *Younger v.*  
26 *Harris*, 401 U.S. 37, 53-54 (1971). "A district court should abstain under *Younger* when:  
27

28 ORDER DISMISSING ACTION -- 1

1 (1) there are ongoing state judicial proceedings,; (2) the proceedings implicate important  
2 state interests; and (3) the state proceedings provide the plaintiff with an adequate  
3 opportunity to raise federal claims." *Meredith v. Oregon*, 321 F.3d 807, 816 (9th Cir.  
4 2003). Here, there appears to be an ongoing state criminal proceeding. While it is  
5 unclear from the documents he presents what charges Plaintiff is facing, any  
6 constitutional issues which arise may be adequately litigated in the Spokane County  
7 Superior Court.

8 Finally, any contention that Petitioner is entitled to challenge his extradition by  
9 means of a habeas petition in a Washington State court proceeding is misplaced. A writ  
10 of habeas corpus is available to the accused to test the legality of a proposed extradition  
11 in the asylum state. *See Michigan v. Doran*, 439 U.S. 282, 289 (1978). Once a prisoner  
12 has been returned to the demanding state, however, the writ of habeas corpus is no longer  
13 available to challenge his confinement upon grounds arising from conduct in the asylum  
14 state. *Mahon v. Justice*, 127 U.S. 700, 706, 09 (1888). Therefore, Petitioner may not  
15 challenge by habeas proceedings in Spokane County the failure of officials in Texas to  
16 properly follow extradition proceedings. Furthermore, any improprieties or irregularities  
17 in the extradition process would not invalidate a subsequent conviction. *See Frisbie v.*  
18 *Collins*, 342 U.S. 519, 522 (1952); *Ker v. Illinois*, 119 U.S. 436, 444 (1886). Petitioner  
19 may wish to explore other avenues of relief.

20 At this time, **IT IS ORDERED** the Petition is **DISMISSED without prejudice**  
21 under Rule 4, Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts,  
22 as Petitioner is not entitled to the relief he seeks in this court.

23 **IT IS SO ORDERED.** The District Court Executive is directed to enter this  
24 Order, enter judgment of dismissal, forward a copy to Petitioner, and close this file.

25 **DATED** this 7th day of June 2007.

26 s/ Justin L. Quackenbush  
27 JUSTIN L. QUACKENBUSH  
28 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE