FILED

JUL 2 9 2009

Clerk, U.S. District and **Bankruptcy Courts**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Alfredo Meza,

v.

Petitioner,

Civil Action No.

09 1412

United States Dep't of Justice et al.,

Respondents.

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Plaintiff, a prisoner, has filed a pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus and an application to proceed in forma pauperis. His application to proceed in forma pauperis will be granted, and the petition will be dismissed without prejudice.

The only subject matter mentioned in the petition for habeas corpus is a request for documents made under the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA"), 5 U.S.C. § 522. A petition for habeas corpus is not a viable vehicle for pursuing a FOIA action. A petition for habeas corpus may be brought only against the prisoner's immediate custodian, Rumsfeld v. Padilla. 542 U.S. 426, 434-35 (2004), and only for the purpose of obtaining relief from an allegedly unlawful detention, see 28 U.S.C. § 2241(c)(3). The filing fee for a habeas corpus petition is \$5.00, and a proper habeas petition is not subject to the filing fee provisions of the Prison Litigation Reform Act of 1996 ("PLRA"). Blair-Bey v. Quick, 151 F.3d 1036, 1040 (D.C. Cir. 1998) ("[T]he PLRA does not apply to actions properly brought in habeas corpus.").

A civil action, initiated by filing a civil complaint, is the appropriate vehicle for use in FOIA cases. The fee for filing a civil action in this court is \$350.00, and that fee is subject to the

filing fee provisions of the PLRA, see 28 U.S.C. § 1915. Although a prisoner whose in forma

pauperis application is granted may proceed without prepaying the entire \$350.00 filing fee, the

prisoner will be assessed the entire \$350.00 in installments over time, collected from his prison

trust fund account.

Because the petitioner has filed a petition for habeas corpus seeking a remedy that is not

available in an action in habeas corpus, the petition will be dismissed without prejudice.

A separate order accompanies this memorandum opinion.

Date: 7/27/09

United States District Judge

2