

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

|                               |   |                                      |
|-------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| THOMAS LEE BAILEY,            | ) |                                      |
|                               | ) |                                      |
| Petitioner,                   | ) |                                      |
|                               | ) |                                      |
| v.                            | ) | Civil Action No. 1:20-cv-01703 (UNA) |
|                               | ) |                                      |
| FRANK BISHOP, <i>et al.</i> , | ) |                                      |
|                               | ) |                                      |
| Respondents.                  | ) |                                      |

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the court on its initial review of petitioner's *pro se* petition for habeas corpus and application for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*. Petitioner is a Maryland state prisoner designated to the North Branch Correctional Institution, located in Cumberland, Maryland. He was convicted in Harford County, Maryland. *See State of Maryland v. Bailey, Thomas Lee*, No. 3R00001585 (Md. filed Nov. 24, 1994); *see also State of Maryland v. Thomas Bailey*, No. 12K94001287 (Md. filed Dec. 28, 1994).

Petitioner challenges his conviction and seeks immediate release. Federal court review of state convictions is available under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 only after the exhaustion of available state remedies. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(1). Thereafter, "an application for a writ of habeas corpus [ ] made by a person in custody under the judgment and sentence of a State court . . . may be filed in the district court for the district wherein such person is in custody or in the district court for the district within which the State court was held which convicted and sentenced [petitioner] and each of such district courts shall have concurrent jurisdiction to entertain the application." 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d). Therefore, this court lacks jurisdiction over this matter.

For the foregoing reasons, the petition will be dismissed. A separate order accompanies this memorandum opinion.

\_\_\_\_\_/S/\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES E. BOASBERG  
United States District Judge

Date: July 24, 2020