

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA

Kareem Al-Jaml Young v. B. M. Trate

Young v. Trate · No. 1:23-cv-00055-TLN-CDB · Decided September 10, 2025

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the Eastern District of California adopted the magistrate judge’s findings and recommendations in a federal prisoner’s 28 U.S.C. § 2241 habeas proceeding. The court dismissed the petition with prejudice for lack of jurisdiction, declined to issue a certificate of appealability, and directed the clerk to close the case.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
JURISDICTION	United States District Court for the Eastern District of California
DECIDED	September 10, 2025
DOCKET	1:23-cv-00055-TLN-CDB
DISPOSITION	dismissed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	The district court reviewed a magistrate judge's findings and recommendations under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). After the petitioner filed no objections, the district court adopted the findings and recommendations and dismissed the § 2241 petition for lack of jurisdiction.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	The district court presumed the magistrate judge's factual findings correct and reviewed the magistrate judge's legal conclusions de novo.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Unpublished district court order; precedential status not stated in the opinion.
PARTIES	Kareem Al-Jaml Young v. B. M. Trate

TOPICS

- federal habeas corpus
- subject matter jurisdiction
- post-conviction relief
- civil procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

- Federal habeas corpus
- Federal civil procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and recommendations when petitioner filed no objections after proper service.
2. Whether the petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 should be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.

HOLDINGS

1. The district court presumes the magistrate judge's findings of fact correct and reviews the magistrate judge's conclusions of law de novo.
2. The petition for a writ of habeas corpus was properly dismissed with prejudice for lack of jurisdiction.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“The Court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge’s conclusions of law are reviewed de novo.” (at 2)

“The petition for writ of habeas corpus (ECF No. 1) is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE” (at 2)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Kareem Al-Jaml Young, a federal prisoner proceeding pro se and in forma pauperis, filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The magistrate judge recommended dismissal for lack of jurisdiction. Although a copy of the findings and recommendations was apparently returned, the court determined that petitioner was properly served after the findings were re-served at his updated address, and petitioner filed no objections.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Petitioner filed a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241. On June 16, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge recommended dismissal for lack of jurisdiction. The findings and recommendations were re-served after petitioner notified the court of a change of address, but petitioner filed no objections within the applicable deadline. The district court adopted the findings and recommendations in full, dismissed the petition with prejudice, declined to issue a certificate of appealability, and directed the clerk to close the case.

DISPOSITION

dismissed

CASES CITED

- Orand v. United States, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979)
- Robbins v. Carey, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007)

OPINION

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 EASTERN DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA 10 11 KAREEM AL-JAML YOUNG, 12 Petitioner, No. 1:23-cv-00055-TLN-CDB
13 14 v. ORDER B. M. TRATE, 15 Respondent. 16 17 18 Petitioner Kareem Al-Jaml Young
("Petitioner") is a federal prisoner proceeding pro se 19 and in forma pauperis with a petition for
writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241.

20 This matter was referred to a United States Magistrate Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 21 636(b)
(1)(B) and Local Rule 302(c)(17). 22 On June 16, 2025, the assigned magistrate judge issued
findings and recommendations 23 that the petition be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. (ECF No.
20.)

On June 20, 2025, 24 Petitioner filed a notice of change of address and the findings and
recommendations were re- 25 served on Petitioner at his new address that same date. (ECF No.
21.) The findings and 26 recommendations contained notice that any objections were to be filed
within twenty-one days 27 after being served. (ECF No. 20.) This deadline has now passed, and no
objections were filed.

28 /// 1 Although it appears from the file that Petitioner's copy of the findings and 2
recommendations was returned, Petitioner was properly served. The findings and 3
recommendations were re-served on Petitioner on the day Petitioner notified the Court of his 4
change of address. (ECF No. 20.) Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the 5
record address of the party is fully effective.

6 The Court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. See *Orand v. United States*, 602 7 F.2d
207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. 8 See
Robbins v. Carey, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) ("[D]eterminations of law by the 9
magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court[.]").

10 Having reviewed the file, the Court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by
11 the record and the proper analysis. 12 Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 13 1. The
findings and recommendations issued on June 16, 2025, (ECF No. 20), are ADOPTED in full; 14
2.

The petition for writ of habeas corpus (ECF No. 1) is DISMISSED WITH 15 PREJUDICE; 16 3.
The Court DECLINES to issue a certificate of appealability; and 17 4. The Clerk of Court is
directed to CLOSE the case. 18 Date: September 9, 2025 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28