

**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.

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