


OCT - 9 1915

**Clerk, U.S. District & Bankruptcy
Courts for the District of Columbia**

Plaintiff presents an attack on his criminal sentence in the guise of a civil action, and this is not a subject over which the Court has jurisdiction. *See, e.g., Burnell v. Office of the Attorney General of the United States*, No. 1:14-cv-02206, 2014 WL 7411036, at *1 (D.D.C. Dec. 30, 2014), *appeal filed*, No. 15-5027 (D.C. Cir. Jan. 29, 2015). To the extent that a remedy is available to plaintiff, his claim must be addressed to the sentencing court in a motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255. *See Taylor v. U.S. Bd. of Parole*, 194 F.2d 882, 883 (D.C. Cir. 1952) (stating that a motion to vacate under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 is the proper vehicle for challenging the constitutionality of a statute under which a defendant is convicted); *Ojo v. Immigration & Naturalization Serv.*, 106 F.3d 680, 683 (5th Cir. 1997) (explaining that the sentencing court is the only court with jurisdiction to hear a defendant's complaint regarding errors that occurred before or during sentencing).

Plaintiff has stated no claim for relief in this court, and therefore the complaint will be dismissed. An Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.


United States District Judge

DATE: *Oct 2, 2015*