

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

MARIO YOUNG,

Petitioner,

v.

JOSEPH SCIBANA, Warden,

Respondent.

ORDER

04-C-585-C

On August 24, 2004, I stayed a decision whether to issue an order to show cause or enter a stay in this case pending a decision from the Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit on the appeal filed in White v. Scibana, 03-C-581. I gave petitioner until September 6, 2004, in which to submit documentation revealing his pre-release and release dates as they are presently calculated by the Bureau of Prisons. I told petitioner that if his documentation were to show that he would be entitled to imminent release or eligible for an imminent halfway house placement after his good conduct time is recalculated in accordance with White, I would not impose a stay pending resolution of the appeal.

On August 27, 2004, petitioner submitted the documentation requested in the August 24 order. His sentence monitoring computation data sheet shows that he was sentenced on April 16, 2004 to a term of 24 months of imprisonment. Under the Bureau's

current computation of petitioner's good time credits at 94 days, his projected release date is December 21, 2004, and his projected pre-release preparation date is October 20, 2004. If petitioner's good conduct time were to be recalculated in accordance with White v. Scibana, 314 F. Supp.2d 834 (W.D. Wis. 2004), his projected release date would be shortened by approximately 14 days to early December and his eligibility for pre-release may be moved to an earlier date as well. 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. Gonzalez v. O'Connell, 355 F.3d 1010, 1016 (7th Cir. 2004) (court may waive exhaustion requirements for § 2241 when necessary to prevent prejudice caused by unreasonable delay). 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, which I construe to include his July 29 submission, 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 three copies of his petition, his supplemental documentation and this order, all of which are to be served on the individuals listed above. 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 10, 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 1st day of September, 2004.

BY THE COURT:

BARBARA B. CRABB
District Judge