

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF
ILLINOIS

Luedtke v. Lillard

No. 3:25-CV-942-NJR (S.D. Ill. Feb. 11, 2026) · No. 3:25-CV-942-NJR · Decided February 11, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois denied James Luedtke’s motion for reconsideration of the dismissal of his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition. The court held that Luedtke’s claims challenged the imposition of his sentence, rather than the Bureau of Prisons’ execution of it, and therefore had to be brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 in the sentencing court. The court also explained that Brown and Narvaez did not support relief under § 2241 in light of the Supreme Court’s decision in Jones v. Hendrix.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Nancy J. Rosenstengel
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Southern District of Illinois
DECIDED	February 11, 2026
DOCKET	3:25-CV-942-NJR
DISPOSITION	other
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Petitioner moved under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) for reconsideration of the dismissal of his 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas petition.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	A Rule 59(e) motion may be granted only upon a clear showing of newly discovered evidence or a manifest error of law or fact. A manifest error is a wholesale disregard, misapplication, or failure to recognize controlling precedent.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	nonprecedential
PARTIES	James Luedtke v. Thomas Lillard

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- successive petitions
- motion for reconsideration
- post-conviction relief
- sentencing

PRACTICE AREAS

federal habeas corpus

post-conviction relief

federal sentencing

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Luedtke established newly discovered evidence or a manifest error of law or fact warranting relief under Rule 59(e).
2. Whether a prisoner may use a 28 U.S.C. § 2241 petition to challenge alleged legal errors in the imposition of a sentence by the sentencing court by characterizing the claim as a challenge to the BOP's execution or computation of the sentence.
3. Whether *Brown v. Caraway* and *Narvaez v. United States* required the Court to permit Luedtke's § 2241 petition under the savings clause of 28 U.S.C. § 2255(e).

HOLDINGS

1. Luedtke did not establish newly discovered evidence or a manifest error of law or fact, so reconsideration was unwarranted.
2. Claims alleging legal errors in the imposition of a sentence by the sentencing court must be brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 in the sentencing court, rather than under § 2241 as challenges to the BOP's execution of the sentence.
3. Luedtke could not use § 2241 to circumvent the restrictions on successive § 2255 motions through the savings clause.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“A “manifest error of law” “is not demonstrated by the disappointment of the losing party. It is the ‘wholesale disregard, misapplication, or failure to recognize controlling precedent.’ ””

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Luedtke is serving a 37-year sentence following convictions for bank robbery, brandishing a firearm during a crime of violence, being a felon in possession of a weapon, and two counts of making false statements to obtain a firearm. He challenged criminal-history points, the use of a state firearm conviction as a career-offender predicate, and the denial of a sentence reduction under 18 U.S.C. § 3582(c)(2) and Amendment 821 to the Sentencing Guidelines. Although he characterized the errors as involving the BOP's sentence computation, the Court determined that the alleged errors arose from the sentencing court's imposition of the sentence.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Court previously dismissed Luedtke's § 2241 petition on preliminary review under Rule 4 because his claims challenged the imposition of his sentence by the sentencing court rather than the execution of the sentence by the Bureau of Prisons. Luedtke moved for reconsideration, arguing that the BOP's continued use of the allegedly incorrect sentence computation made the claim cognizable under § 2241. The Court construed the motion as one under Rule 59(e) and denied it.

DISPOSITION

other

CASES CITED

- United States v. Luedtke, 125 F. App'x 732 (2005)
- Jones v. Hendrix, 599 U.S. 465, 469 (2023)
- Harrington v. City of Chicago, 433 F.3d 542, 546 (7th Cir. 2006)
- Oto v. Metropolitan Life Ins. Co., 224 F.2d 601, 606 (7th Cir. 2000)
- Brown v. Caraway, 719 F.3d 583, 586, 588 (7th Cir. 2013)
- Narvaez v. United States, 674 F.3d 621 (7th Cir. 2011)
- In re Davenport, 147 F.3d 605 (7th Cir. 1998)
- Luedtke v. Lillard, No. 24-2615 (7th Cir. 2025)
- United States v. Luedtke, Case No. 1:03-cr-00037-WCG-1, Doc. 162 (E.D. Wis. Oct. 25, 2024)
- Luedtke v. United States, No. 05-C-0489, 2005 WL 1229686, at *5 (E.D. Wis. May 23, 2005)