

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

<p>MARTIN MARSHAL,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Petitioner,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>DANELA AND JOLYNN OLDFIELD,</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Respondent.</p>	<p>No. C14-05346 RBL/KLS</p> <p>ORDER TO FILE A COMPLETE APPLICATION TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS AND AN AMENDED HABEAS CORPUS PETITION NAMING A PROPER RESPONDENT</p>
---	--

This petition for a writ of habeas corpus had been referred to the undersigned Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), Local Magistrate Judge Rules 3 and 4. Petitioner, Martin Marshal, is attempting to challenge a state conviction and sentence. He originally filed the action as a civil rights claim and the Clerk’s Office correctly opened the action as a Habeas Corpus petition filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

The Clerk’s Office sent Mr. Marshal a habeas in forma pauperis application and a habeas corpus form petition. Dkt. 2. Mr. Marsahl returned only the first page of the *in forma pauperis* application and when he filled out the form petition he listed his alleged victim and her mother as respondents. Dkt. 3 and 4.

ORDER - 1

1 Mr. Marshal must start over. The Clerk's Office is directed to send him another  
2 packet. Mr. Marshal must fill out and return the entire *in forma pauperis* application. Mr.  
3 Marshal also must fill out another habeas corpus petition because alleged victims and their  
4 mothers are not the proper party to respond to a federal habeas corpus petition.

5 The proper respondent is "the person having custody of the person detained." 28 U.S.C.  
6 § 2243. This person is usually the superintendent of the facility where petitioner, Mr. Marshal, is  
7 incarcerated. Mr. Marshal's failure to name the correct party deprives this Court of personal  
8 jurisdiction. *See Stanley v. California Supreme Court*, 21 F.3d 359, 360 (9th Cir. 1994).

9 The Court Orders Mr. Marshal to file an amended petition on the form provided by the  
10 Court. The amended petition will act as a complete substitute for the original. The amended  
11 petition is due on or before July 11, 2014. Failure to comply with this order will result in a  
12 Report and Recommendation that this action be dismissed for failure to comply with a court  
13 order and lack of in personam jurisdiction over respondent.  
14

15 The Clerk is directed to mail a copy of this Order to petitioner and note the **July 11,**  
16 **2014**, deadline on the court's calendar.  
17

18 Dated this 5<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2014.  
19

20 

21 Karen L. Strombom  
22 United States Magistrate Judge  
23  
24  
25  
26