

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

---

JEFFREY HUNTER,

Petitioner,

v.

WARDEN SCIBANA, F.C.I. Oxford,

Respondent.

---

ORDER

04-C-615-C

In White v. Scibana, 314 F. Supp. 2d 834 (W.D. Wis. 2004), I concluded that the Bureau of Prisons was acting contrary to 18 U.S.C. 3624(b) by calculating petitioner Yancey White's good conduct time on the basis of the actual time he had served rather than his imposed sentence. I granted White's petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and ordered the warden to recalculate White's good conduct time in accordance with § 3624(b). Respondent has appealed that decision and the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit has granted respondent's motion for expedited treatment of the appeal and directed that oral argument be scheduled during the month of September.

Petitioner Jeffrey Hunter is an inmate at the Federal Correctional Institution in Oxford, Wisconsin. His petition under § 2241 raises the same issue as that in White: he alleges that the bureau is calculating his good conduct time on the basis of time served rather

than the sentence imposed. (Petitioner submitted his petition on forms for filing a motion under 28 U.S.C. § 2255, but his claim is one cognizable under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. It is irrelevant that he has presented his claim on the incorrect form.) Petitioner has paid the \$5 filing fee.

In the time that has passed since the Yancey White's petition was granted, several other prisoners at the Oxford facility have filed habeas corpus petitions challenging the Bureau of Prisons' method of calculating their good time credits. I have stayed the proceedings in most of these actions pending a decision on the appeal filed in White's case. I have decided to issue orders to show cause if (1) the petitioner submits a sentence computation from the Bureau of Prisons showing the inmate's term of imprisonment, good conduct time that has been both earned and disallowed, current release date and pre-release preparation date; and (2) I can conclude on the basis of that information that the petitioner would be entitled to imminent release or eligible for an imminent halfway house transfer after his good conduct time is recalculated in accordance with White.

In this case, it appears from the documentation petitioner submitted with his petition that his pre-release date is imminent and that he would be prejudiced by a stay of the proceedings. The documentation reveals that petitioner was committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons on November 13, 2001 to serve a 70-month sentence. His projected pre-release date under the Bureau of Prisons' method of calculating good conduct time is November 24, 2004. If his good time credit is recalculated in accordance with White, he

may be eligible for release to a halfway house approximately 28 days earlier. I conclude that petitioner will be irreparably harmed if he is forced to wait until the court of appeals decides White before he can obtain a ruling in his case.

Petitioner does not allege that he has exhausted his administrative remedies. Nevertheless, I will waive this requirement because any delay in receiving relief will cause petitioner substantial prejudice and because the Bureau of Prisons has predetermined the issue. Gonzalez v. O'Connell, 355 F.3d 1010, 1016 (7th Cir. 2004) (court may waive exhaustion requirements for § 2241 to prevent prejudice caused by unreasonable delay or when agency has predetermined issue). Accordingly, respondent will be directed to show cause why this petition should not be granted.

Petitioner should note that because he is not proceeding in forma pauperis, it is his obligation to serve the petition on the respondent. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 81, the rules governing service of process in civil actions are applicable to this proceeding because no specific rules governing service of process in § 2241 habeas corpus actions exist elsewhere in a statute or in the Rules Governing Section 2254 and 2255 cases. The rule governing service of process in civil actions brought against a federal official in his official capacity is Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(i). According to this rule, petitioner's petition must be sent with a copy of this court's order by certified mail to: 1) the respondent; 2) the United States Attorney for the Western District of Wisconsin; and 3) the Attorney General in Washington, D.C. The address for the United States Attorney in this district is: The Hon. J.B. Van Hollen, 660 W.

Washington Ave., Madison, WI, 53703. The address for the Attorney General in Washington, D.C. is: The Hon. John Ashcroft, United States Attorney General, 950 Pennsylvania Ave., N.W., Rm. 5111, Washington, DC 20530. Enclosed to petitioner with a copy of this order are the extra copies of his petition and this court's order. Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(l), petitioner is requested to submit proof to the court that he served his petition by certified mail. A copy of the postmarked certified mail receipt for each of the individuals to whom the petition was sent will constitute proof of service.

#### ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that respondent may have until September 4, 2004, in which to show cause why this petition for a writ of habeas corpus should not be granted on petitioner's claim that the Bureau of Prisons is calculating his good time credits in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 3624(b)(1). There is no need for a traverse.

Entered this 25th day of August, 2004.

BY THE COURT:

BARBARA B. CRABB  
District Judge