

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

JERMAINE JOSEPH DUNLAP,	)	
	)	
<i>Petitioner,</i>	)	
	)	
v.	)	Civ. No. 23-1011 (UNA)
	)	
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	)	
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,	)	
	)	
<i>Respondent.</i>	)	

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

This matter is before the Court on yet another Petition for a Writ Habeas Corpus (ECF No. 1) from Jermaine Joseph Dunlap, a California state prisoner, and his application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF No. 2). Notwithstanding the unintelligible allegations of the petition, having filed a habeas petition, the Court presumes that petitioner challenges – again – his conviction and sentence and demands his release from custody.

As petitioner well knows, he has no recourse in this district. *See, e.g., Dunlap v. U.S. District Court in the District of Columbia*, No. 23-cv-0461 (D.D.C. Mar. 6, 2023) (dismissing petition without prejudice for want of jurisdiction); *Dunlap v. Dep’t Rev. Bd.*, No. 14-cv-0145, 2014 WL 414156, at \*1 (D.D.C. Jan. 30, 2014) (concluding that “plaintiff has no recourse in habeas in the District of Columbia”).

Habeas review of a state court conviction under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 is available only after exhaustion of state remedies, *see* 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(1), and only “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). This petitioner was convicted and sentenced in California, and he has no recourse in the District of Columbia.

The Court will grant petitioner’s application to proceed *in forma pauperis* and dismiss his petition without prejudice for want of jurisdiction. A separate Order accompanies this Memorandum Opinion.

DATE: April 17, 2023

/s/  
TANYA S. CHUTKAN  
United States District Judge