

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

Pedro J. Reyes Muriel v. Wayne T. Salisbury, Jr.

Reyes Muriel v. Salisbury · No. C.A. No. 25-cv-424-JJM-PAS · Decided January 15, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Rhode Island ordered habeas petitioner Pedro J. Reyes Muriel to file an amended petition complying with Rule 2 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. The court found that the petition did not state specific facts supporting each ground for relief and denied the motion for an evidentiary hearing without prejudice as moot.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the District of Rhode Island
WRITING FOR THE COURT	John J. McConnell, Jr.
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the District of Rhode Island
DECIDED	January 15, 2026
DOCKET	C.A. No. 25-cv-424-JJM-PAS
DISPOSITION	remanded
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Federal habeas petitioner filed a petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 and moved for an evidentiary hearing. The court found that the petition failed to comply with Rule 2 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases and ordered petitioner to file an amended petition.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The court reviewed the petition for compliance with Rule 2 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases based on the allegations appearing on the face of the petition.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Pedro J. Reyes Muriel v. Wayne T. Salisbury, Jr.

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- post-conviction relief
- pleadings
- motions to dismiss
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- federal habeas corpus
- post-conviction relief
- civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the habeas petition substantially complied with Rule 2 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases.
2. Whether the petitioner was entitled to an evidentiary hearing before filing a compliant amended petition.

HOLDINGS

1. A § 2254 petitioner must state specific, particularized facts supporting each ground for relief, with enough detail for the court to determine from the face of the petition whether further habeas review is warranted. The petition did not satisfy that requirement.
2. The motion for an evidentiary hearing was denied without prejudice as moot because the petitioner first had to submit an amended petition complying with Rule 2.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“In order to substantially comply with the Habeas Rule 2, a petitioner must state specific, particularized facts that entitle him or her to habeas corpus relief for each ground specified.”

“These facts must consist of sufficient detail to enable the Court to determine, from the face of the petition alone, whether the petition merits further habeas corpus review.”

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The petitioner sought federal habeas corpus relief and requested an evidentiary hearing. His petition did not clearly identify the facts supporting each asserted ground for relief. Because the petition lacked an understandable statement of the claims and supporting facts, the court concluded that respondent could not meaningfully respond and that the court could not assess whether the claims had merit.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Pedro J. Reyes Muriel filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus and a motion for an evidentiary hearing. The district court determined that the petition did not state specific facts supporting each ground for relief and therefore did not substantially comply with Habeas Rule 2. The court ordered an amended petition within sixty days, directed respondent to respond within thirty days thereafter, and denied the evidentiary-hearing motion without prejudice as moot.

DISPOSITION

remanded

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

Petitioner must file an amended petition within sixty days that clearly specifies each ground for relief and states the facts supporting each ground. Respondent must file a response within thirty days after the amended petition is filed. Failure to comply may result in dismissal.

CASES CITED

- Mayle v. Felix, 545 U.S. 644 (2005)
- Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519 (1972)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-district-of-rhode-island/2026/pedro-j-reyes-muriel-v-wayne-t-salisbury-jr-27mjnei0>