1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON		
9	AT TACOMA		
10	Emanuel L Finch Sr,		
11		Plaintiff,	CASE NO. C17-5293 RBL-DWC
12	v.		ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE
13	Keith Miller et al.,		
14		Defendants.	
15			
16	Plaintiff Emanuel L. Finch, Sr., proceeding pro se, filed a Complaint pursuant to 42		
17	U.S.C. §1983. See Dkt. 1-1. Having reviewed the Complaint, the Court declines to serve the		
18	Complaint as Plaintiff is challenging the fact and duration of his confinement, not his conditions		
19	of confinement. The Court, however, provides Plaintiff leave to file a habeas corpus petition by		
20	June 5, 2017 to cure the deficiencies identified herein.		
21	BACKGROUND		
22	Plaintiff, who is currently incarcerated at the Airway Heights Corrections Center		
23	("AHCC") and alleges Defendants violated Plaintiff's Fourth and Sixth Amendment rights when		
24	he was arrested in 2010 and convicted in 2011. Dkt. 1-1. Plaintiff requests the Court overturn his		

conviction on the grounds Plaintiff was deprived of effective assistance of counsel and
 Defendant Miller entered into Plaintiff's home without probable cause or a warrant. Dkt. 1-1 at
 20.

4

DISCUSSION

5 An "action lying at the core of habeas corpus is one that goes directly to the constitutionality of the prisoner's physical confinement itself and seeks either immediate release 6 7 from that confinement or the shortening of its duration. With regard to such actions, habeas corpus is now considered the prisoner's exclusive remedy." Preiser v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 475, 8 9 503 (1973) (internal quotation omitted). "A civil rights action, in contrast, is the proper method of challenging conditions of confinement." Badea v. Cox, 931 F.3d 573, 574 (9th Cir. 1991). 10 Here, Plaintiff challenges his physical confinement, asking the Court to "overturn" his 11 12 conviction. Dkt. 1-1. As Plaintiff's claims challenge the fact and duration of his custody, his 13 claims are properly raised in a 28 U.S.C. § 2254 petition. 14 If Plaintiff intends to pursue the claims alleged in his Complaint, he must file a habeas 15 corpus petition on the form provided by the Court, including only claims challenging the fact or 16 duration of his custody. Under Rule 2(a) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, "the 17 petition must name as respondent the state officer who as custody." Further, 18 [t]he petition must: (1) specify all the grounds for relief available to the petitioner; (2) state the facts supporting each ground; (3) state the relief requested; (4) be printed, typewritten, or legibly 19 handwritten; and (5) be signed under penalty of perjury by the 20 petitioner or person authorized to sign it for the petitioner under 28 U.S.C. §2242. 21 *Id.* at Rule 2(c). The Petition must "substantially follow" a form prescribed by this Court or the 22 form attached to the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. Id. at Rule 2(d). The petition should 23 be an original and not a copy, it should contain the same case number, and it may not incorporate 24

any part of the Complaint by reference. The petition will act as a complete substitute for the
 Complaint, and not as a supplement. If Plaintiff fails to adequately address the issues raised
 herein and file a petition on or before June 5, 2017, the undersigned may recommend dismissal
 of this action.

Plaintiff also filed a Motion for Leave to File Overlength Memorandum in Support of his
Complaint. Dkt. 1-2. Plaintiff's Proposed Memorandum is over 200 pages in length. Plaintiff has
presented nothing to show the request should be granted, and has not shown this case is
unusually complicated or presents novel issues to justify the request. Thus, Plaintiff's Motion is
denied. If Plaintiff wishes to pursue this cause of action, he must file an amended pleading which
complies with the Local Rules.

The Clerk is directed to: (1) provide Plaintiff with the forms for filing a petition for
habeas corpus relief pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254; (2) re-note Plaintiff's Motion to Proceed *In Forma Pauperis* for June 5, 2017; and (3) provide copies of this Order to Plaintiff.
Dated this 4th day of May, 2017.

David W. Christel United States Magistrate Judge