## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

AMU A. ALSTON, :

Petitioner,

v. : Civil Action No. 07-2354 (RMU)

UNITED STATES PAROLE

COMMISSION,

•

Respondent.

## **MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the Court on consideration of the petitioner's petition for a writ of habeas corpus. Because the petition is moot, the court dismisses it.

Generally, the petitioner alleges that the United States Parole Commission

("Commission") abused its discretion and violated his right to due process by revoking his parole
and ordering his return to custody. *See* Petition ("Pet.") at 1-3; *see id.*, Ex. (January 30, 2007

Notice of Action revoking parole and continuing to presumptive re-parole on December 20, 2007

after service of 16 months). According to the Federal Bureau of Prisons Inmate Locator

(www.bop.gov), the petitioner was released on December 20, 2007. Because the petitioner

appears to have served the entire parole violator term and has since been released from custody,
the Court deems the petition moot. *See Lane v. Williams*, 455 U.S. 624, 631 (1982) (attack on
sentences which expired during course of habeas proceedings rendered case moot); *Kimberlin v. United States Parole Comm'n*, No. 03-5017, 2004 WL 885215 at \*1 (D.C. Cir. Apr. 22, 2004)

(finding moot a habeas petition challenging Parole Commission's decisions to revoke parole and
to delay reparole because the petitioner had been "released from the confinement imposed as a

result of those decisions"); *Thorndyke v. Washington*, 224 F. Supp. 2d 72, 74 (D.D.C. 2002) (petitioner's claim of unlawful custody before his revocation hearing and findings of fact on charge of parole violation found moot after issuance of corrected Notice of Action).

Accordingly, the court denies and dismisses the petition as moot. An Order consistent with this Memorandum Opinion is separately and contemporaneously issued this 14th day of May, 2008.

RICARDO M. URBINA United States District Judge