

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Griffin v. Doerer

Griffin · No. 1:25-cv-00015 JLT HBK (HC) · Decided May 22, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations and dismissed Raymond Alan Griffin’s 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition without prejudice. The court concluded that Griffin failed to state a cognizable habeas claim, failed to amend as ordered, and failed to prosecute the action; it directed the Clerk to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Jennifer L. Thurston
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	May 22, 2025
DOCKET	1:25-cv-00015 JLT HBK (HC)
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner sought habeas relief under 28 U.S.C. § 2241, asserting actual innocence of his career-offender classification. After preliminary review found the claim noncognizable, the magistrate judge granted leave to amend. Petitioner did not amend, failed to prosecute, and did not object to the findings and recommendations. The district court adopted the recommendations and dismissed the petition without prejudice.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	De novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) of the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations because the district court reviewed and adopted them.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	unpublished district court order; nonprecedential
PARTIES	Raymond Alan Griffin v. Doerer, et al.

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- post-conviction relief
- sanctions
- appellate procedure
- standard of review

PRACTICE AREAS

federal habeas corpus

post-conviction relief

civil procedure

appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the petition should be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute and failure to comply with the court's order granting leave to amend.
2. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations after conducting de novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).
3. Whether a certificate of appealability is required for an appeal from dismissal of a § 2241 petition concerning federal custody.

HOLDINGS

1. The petition may be dismissed without prejudice because Petitioner failed to file an amended petition, failed to prosecute the action, and failed to comply with the court's order.
2. After conducting de novo review under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the district court properly adopted the findings and recommendations in full.
3. A certificate of appealability is not required because the petition was brought under § 2241 and did not challenge detention arising from process issued by a state court.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The petition for writ of habeas corpus (Doc. 1) is DISMISSED without prejudice.” (at 9-10)

“Having carefully reviewed the matter, the Court concludes the Findings and Recommendations are supported by the record and proper analysis.” (at 5-6)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Raymond Alan Griffin, a federal prisoner proceeding pro se, filed a § 2241 petition claiming that he was actually innocent of his career-offender classification. The magistrate judge determined that the petition did not state a cognizable habeas claim and granted leave to amend. Griffin did not file an amended petition, did not prosecute the action, and did not submit objections to the recommendation of dismissal.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The magistrate judge conducted a preliminary review and determined that the petition failed to state a cognizable habeas claim. The court granted leave to amend, but Petitioner filed no amended petition. The magistrate judge recommended dismissal without prejudice based on failure to prosecute and failure to comply with a court order, and the district court adopted those findings after Petitioner filed no objections.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- *Applied Underwriters v. Lichtenegger*, 913 F.3d 884, 889 (9th Cir. 2019)
- *Wilkerson v. Wheeler*, 772 F.3d 834, 838-39 (9th Cir. 2014)
- *Forde v. U.S. Parole Commission*, 114 F.3d 878 (9th Cir. 1997)
- *Ojo v. INS*, 106 F.3d 680, 681-682 (5th Cir. 1997)
- *Bradshaw v. Story*, 86 F.3d 164, 166 (10th Cir. 1996)

Retrieved from lawtools.ai · <https://lawtools.ai/cases/federal/united-states-district-court-for-the-eastern-district-of-cal/2025/griffin-v-doerer-fjxc4iky>