

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Kristy Lynn Felkins v. Warden

No. 2:25-cv-3185-DMC-P · No. No. 2:25-cv-3185-DMC-P · Decided November 13, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California ordered the transfer of Kristy Lynn Felkins's pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Because Felkins was incarcerated at FCI Victorville in an area covered by the Central District of California, the court transferred the matter under the immediate-custodian and district-of-confinement rules.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Dennis M. Cota
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	November 13, 2025
DOCKET	No. 2:25-cv-3185-DMC-P
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner, a federal inmate proceeding pro se, filed an application for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The Eastern District of California transferred the matter to the Central District of California because petitioner was incarcerated within the Central District's geographic jurisdiction.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unknown
PARTIES	Kristy Lynn Felkins v. Warden

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- venue
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Federal habeas corpus
- Federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Which federal district court is the proper forum for a core habeas petition brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 by a federal inmate?

HOLDINGS

1. A core habeas petition under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 should be brought in the district of confinement, where the petitioner's immediate custodian is located; because Felkins was incarcerated in an area covered by the Central District of California, transfer to that district was appropriate.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Ninth Circuit has “affirm[ed] the application of the immediate custodian and district of confinement rules to core habeas petitions filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241, including those filed by immigrant detainees.”” (1)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Kristy Lynn Felkins is a federal inmate incarcerated at FCI Victorville Medium I in Victorville, California. She is serving a sentence for a conviction rendered by the Eastern District of California. Because her place of incarceration is within the area covered by the Central District of California, the court concluded that the petition should be heard there.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Felkins filed a § 2241 habeas petition in the Eastern District of California. The court determined that the immediate custodian and district-of-confinement rules applied and transferred the matter to the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

DISPOSITION

other

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The matter was transferred to the United States District Court for the Central District of California.

CASES CITED

- Doe v. Garland, 109 F.4th 1188, 1199 (9th Cir. 2024)

OPINION

Felkins

PER CURIAM.

1 2 3 4 5 6

7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

8 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 KRISTY LYNN FELKINS, No. 2:25-cv-3185-DMC-P

11 Petitioner, 12 v. ORDER

13 WARDEN,

14 Respondent. 15

16 Petitioner, a federal inmate proceeding pro se, has filed an application for a writ of 17 habeas
corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. Petitioner is presently incarcerated at FCI 18 Victorville
Medium I in Victorville, CA. She is serving a sentence for a conviction rendered by 19 the Eastern
District of California. 20 The Ninth Circuit has “affirm[ed] the application of the immediate
custodian and 21 district of confinement rules to core habeas petitions filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
§ 2241, including 22 those filed by immigrant detainees.” Doe v. Garland, 109 F.4th 1188, 1199
(9th Cir. 2024). In the 23 instant case, Petitioner’s place of incarceration is in an area covered by
the District Court for the 24 Central District of California. 25 / / / 26 / / / 27 / / / 28 / / /]
Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that this matter is transferred to the 2 | United States
District Court for the Central District of California. Id.; 28 U.S.C. § 2241. 3 || Dated: November
13, 2025 Sco

4 DENNIS M. COTA

5 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28