

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

JERMAINE J. DUNLAP,

Petitioner,

v.

SUPERIOR COURT
OF SAN BERNARDINO *et al.*,

Respondents.

)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Civil Action No. 22-2419 (UNA)

MEMORANDUM OPINION

Petitioner is a California state prisoner who has submitted a form “Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus” comprised of incoherent statements. *See Dunlap v. Superior Ct. of City of San Bernardino*, No. 15-cv-00837, 2015 WL 3542827, at *1 (D.D.C. June 5, 2015) (citing cases finding similarly). Unlike the requirements for pleading a civil action, “Rule 2(c) of the Rules Governing Habeas Corpus Cases requires a more detailed statement. [It] instructs the petitioner to specify all the grounds for relief available to him and to state the facts supporting each ground.” *Mayle v. Felix*, 545 U.S. 644, 649 (2005) (cleaned up). The lodged petition comes nowhere near satisfying the habeas pleading standard.

Even if Petitioner could replead satisfactorily, this court would lack jurisdiction over a challenge to his California conviction and custody. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 2241(d) (conferring concurrent jurisdiction “in the district court for the district” where the habeas applicant is confined or the sentencing court is located); sec. 2254 Gov. Rule 2(a) (“If the petitioner is currently in custody under a state-court judgment, the petition must name as respondent the state officer who has custody.”); *Day v. Trump*, 860 F.3d 686, 689 (D.C. Cir. 2017) (The “district court may not

entertain a habeas petition involving present physical custody unless the respondent custodian is within its territorial jurisdiction.”) (citation omitted)). Therefore, this case will be dismissed by separate order.

JIA M. COBB
United States District Judge

Date: October 3, 2022