

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

CHRISTINE PRATER,

Petitioner,

Case Number: 2:07-CV-15036

v.

HON. PAUL D. BORMAN

SUSAN DAVIS

Respondent.

**OPINION AND ORDER (1) DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS
AND (2) DECLINING TO ISSUE CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY**

Petitioner Christine Prater is currently incarcerated at the Camp Valley Correctional Facility in Ypsilanti, Michigan. She has filed a *pro se* petition for a writ of habeas corpus, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254, challenging her conviction for operating a vehicle while under the influence. For the reasons set forth below, the Court denies the petition.

I. BACKGROUND

Petitioner pleaded guilty in Jackson County Circuit Court to operating a vehicle while under the influence of liquor (“OUIL”), third offense, and operating a vehicle under the influence with an occupant of the vehicle under sixteen years of age. On January 4, 2007, she was sentenced as a second habitual offender to two to seven and one-half years imprisonment for the OUIL third and one year for the OUIL with an under-sixteen occupant, to be served concurrently.

Petitioner filed an application for leave to appeal in the Michigan Court of Appeals, raising the following claims:

- I. As the attempted OUIL causing injury cannot be used to enhance [Petitioner’s] instant OUIL conviction, this court must vacate her instant conviction for OUIL [third] offense, and enter instead a conviction for OUIL [second] offense.

II. [Petitioner] must be resentenced because:

- A. The trial court violated defendant's rights under the Fifth, Sixth and Fourteen[th] Amendments by increasing her sentence based upon facts that were never found by a jury beyond a reasonable doubt.
- B. The trial court's reasons for departing are not "substantial and compelling."
- C. Offense variable ten ["OV10"] was incorrectly scored with [ten] points, improperly raising the guidelines sentence range from an intermediate sanction cell to a straddle cell.

The Michigan Court of Appeals denied leave to appeal. *People v. Prater*, No. 278720 (Mich. Ct. App. July 27, 2007).

Petitioner filed an application for leave to appeal in the Michigan Supreme Court, raising the same claims raised before the Michigan Court of Appeals. The Michigan Supreme Court denied leave to appeal. *People v. Prater*, 480 Mich. 927 (2007).

Petitioner then filed the pending petition for a writ of habeas corpus, raising the same claims raised on direct appeal in state court.

II. ANALYSIS

A. Legal Standard

28 U.S.C. § 2254(d) imposes the following standard of review on federal courts reviewing applications for a writ of habeas corpus:

An application for a writ of habeas corpus on behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court shall not be granted with respect to any claim that was adjudicated on the merits in State court proceedings unless the adjudication of the claim –

- (1) resulted in a decision that was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly established Federal law, as determined by the Supreme Court of the United States; or

- (2) resulted in a decision that was based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented in the State court proceedings.

28 U.S.C. § 2254(d). Therefore, federal courts are bound by a state court’s adjudication of a petitioner’s claims unless the state court’s decision was contrary to or involved an unreasonable application of clearly established federal law. *Franklin v. Francis*, 144 F.3d 429 (6th Cir. 1998). Additionally, this Court must presume the correctness of state court factual determinations. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(1)¹; *see also Cremeans v. Chapleau*, 62 F.3d 167, 169 (6th Cir. 1995) (“We give complete deference to state court findings unless they are clearly erroneous”).

The United States Supreme Court has explained the proper application of the “contrary to” clause as follows:

A state-court decision will certainly be contrary to [the Supreme Court’s] clearly established precedent if the state court applies a rule that contradicts the governing law set forth in our cases. . . .

A state-court decision will also be contrary to this Court’s clearly established precedent if the state court confronts a set of facts that are materially indistinguishable from a decision of this Court and nevertheless arrives at a result different from [the Court’s] precedent.

Williams v. Taylor, 529 U.S. 362, 405–06 (2000).

With respect to the “unreasonable application” clause of § 2254(d)(1), the United States Supreme Court held that a federal court should analyze a claim for habeas corpus relief under the “unreasonable application” clause when “a state-court decision unreasonably applies the law of this

¹ 28 U.S.C. § 2254(e)(1) provides, in pertinent part:

In a proceeding instituted by an application for a writ of habeas corpus by a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court, a determination of a factual issue made by a State court shall be presumed to be correct.

Court to the facts of a prisoner’s case.” *Id.* at 409. The Court defined “unreasonable application” as follows:

[A] federal habeas court making the “unreasonable application” inquiry should ask whether the state court’s application of clearly established federal law was objectively unreasonable. . .

[A]n unreasonable application of federal law is different from an incorrect application of federal law. . . . Under § 2254(d)(1)’s “unreasonable application” clause, then, a federal habeas court may not issue the writ simply because that court concludes in its independent judgment that the relevant state-court decision applied clearly established federal law erroneously or incorrectly. Rather, that application must also be unreasonable.

Id. at 409–11.

Where a claim is fairly presented in state court, but the state court, although denying the claim, fails to address it, a federal court on habeas review must conduct an independent review of the state court’s decision. *Harris v. Stovall*, 212 F.3d 940 (6th Cir. 2000). This independent review requires the federal court to “review the record and applicable law to determine whether the state court decision is contrary to federal law, unreasonably applies clearly established law, or is based on an unreasonable determination of the facts in light of the evidence presented.” *Id.* at 943. However, the independent review “is not a full, *de novo* review of the claims, but remains deferential because the court cannot grant relief unless the state court’s result is not in keeping with the strictures of the AEDPA.” *Id.*

A. Conviction Error

In her first habeas claim, Petitioner argues that the trial court erred in sentencing her under the OUIL third offense, when she only had one prior qualifying OUIL conviction.

Petitioner’s entire argument in this regard is based upon state law. “[A] state court’s interpretation of state law, including one announced on direct appeal of the challenged conviction,

binds a federal court sitting on habeas review.” *Bradshaw v. Richey*, 546 U.S. 74, 76 (2005). “[S]tate courts are the ultimate expositors of state law.” *Mullaney v. Wilbur*, 421 U.S. 684, 691 (1975). Therefore, this claim, which asserts only alleged violations of state law, is not cognizable on habeas corpus review.

B. Sentencing Errors

Petitioner presents three sentence-related claims for habeas corpus relief. First, she argues that the trial court violated *Blakely v. Washington*, 542 U.S. 296 (2004) in sentencing her based upon facts not admitted by her or submitted to a jury. In *Apprendi v. New Jersey*, 530 U.S. 466 (2000), the Supreme Court held that “[o]ther than the fact of a prior conviction, any fact that increases the penalty for a crime beyond the prescribed statutory maximum must be submitted to a jury, and proved beyond a reasonable doubt.” 530 U.S. at 490. Michigan has an indeterminate sentencing system for most crimes, including those for which Petitioner was convicted. The maximum term of imprisonment is set by law. Mich. Comp. Laws § 769.8(1); *see also People v. Drohan*, 475 Mich. 140, 160–61 (2006). In *Blakely*, 542 U.S. 296 (2004), the Supreme Court addressed indeterminate sentencing systems and held that such systems do not violate the Sixth Amendment. The Court explained:

[The Sixth Amendment] limits judicial power only to the extent that the claimed judicial power infringes on the province of the jury. Indeterminate sentencing does not do so. It increases judicial discretion, to be sure, but not at the expense of the jury's traditional function of finding the facts essential to lawful imposition of the penalty. Of course indeterminate schemes involve judicial factfinding, in that a judge (like a parole board) may implicitly rule on those facts he deems important to the exercise of his sentencing discretion. But the facts do not pertain to whether the defendant has a legal right to a lesser sentence—and that makes all the difference insofar as judicial impingement upon the traditional role of the jury is concerned. In a system that says the judge may punish burglary with 10 to 40 years, every burglar knows he is risking 40 years in jail. In a system that punishes burglary with a 10-year sentence, with another 30 added for use of a gun, the burglar who enters

a home unarmed is entitled to no more than a 10-year sentence—and by reason of the Sixth Amendment the facts bearing upon that entitlement must be found by a jury.

Id. at 308–09.

Judicial factfinding may not be used to impose a sentence “beyond the prescribed statutory maximum.” *Apprendi*, 530 U.S. at 490. In this case, the sentencing court did not exceed the statutory maximum for Petitioner’s crimes. Therefore, the sentencing scheme did not run afoul of the Sixth Amendment. Because *Blakely* does not apply to indeterminate sentencing schemes like the one utilized in Michigan, the trial court’s sentence did not violate Petitioner’s constitutional rights. See *Tironi v. Birkett*, No. 06-1557, 2007 WL 3226198, at *1 (6th Cir. Oct. 26, 2007) (“*Blakely* does not apply to Michigan’s indeterminate sentencing scheme.”); *Minner v. Vasbinder*, 2007 WL 1469419, at *4 (E.D. Mich. May 21, 2007); *Chatman v. Lafler*, 2007 WL 1308677, at *2 (E.D. Mich. May 3, 2007); *Jones v. Bergh*, 2006 WL 1007602, at *1–2 (E.D. Mich. April 17, 2006); *George v. Burt*, 2006 WL 156396, at *5 (E.D. Mich. Jan. 20, 2006); *Walton v. McKee*, 2005 WL 1343060, at *3 (E.D. Mich. June 1, 2005). Habeas relief, therefore, is denied.

Second, Petitioner argues that the trial court failed to provide substantial and compelling reasons for departing from the sentencing guidelines. Under Mich. Comp. Laws § 769.34(3), a trial court must provide substantial and compelling reasons for departing from state sentencing guidelines. “In conducting habeas review, a federal court is limited to deciding whether a conviction violated the Constitution, laws, or treaties of the United States.” *Estelle v. McGuire*, 502 U.S. 62, 68 (1991). Whether a sentencing court had substantial and compelling reasons for departing from the sentencing guidelines is a matter of state law. *Howard v. White*, 76 Fed. App’x 52, 53 (6th Cir. 2003) (holding that a state court’s application of sentencing guidelines is a matter of state concern

only); *see also* *McPhail v. Renico*, 412 F. Supp. 2d 647, 656 (E.D. Mich. 2006); *Robinson v. Stegall*, 157 F. Supp. 2d 802, 823 (E.D. Mich.2001); *Welch v. Burke*, 49 F. Supp. 2d 992, 1009 (E.D. Mich. 1999). Thus, this claim is not cognizable on federal habeas review.

Finally, Petitioner argues that offense variable 10 was incorrectly scored. “[A] claim that the trial court mis-scored offense variables in determining the state sentencing guidelines is not cognizable on habeas corpus review.” *See Adams v. Burt*, 471 F. Supp. 2d 835, 844 (E.D. Mich. 2007); *see also* *Cook v. Stegall*, 56 F. Supp. 2d 788, 797 (E.D. Mich. 1999)(same); *Thomas v. Foltz*, 654 F. Supp. 105, 106–07 (E.D. Mich. 1987) (same). Therefore, habeas corpus relief is not available for this claim.

C. Certificate of Appealability

A district court, in its discretion, may decide whether to issue a certificate of appealability (“COA”) at the time the court rules on a petition for a writ of habeas corpus or may wait until a notice of appeal is filed to make such a determination. *Castro v. United States*, 310 F.3d 900, 903 (6th Cir. 2002). In denying the habeas petition, the Court has carefully reviewed the petition, the state court record, and the relevant law, and concludes that it is presently in the best position to decide whether to issue a COA. *See id.* at 901 (*quoting Lyons v. Ohio Adult Parole Auth.*, 105 F.3d 1063, 1072 (6th Cir.1997)), overruled in part on other grounds by *Lindh v. Murphy*, 521 U.S. 320 (1997)) (“[Because] ‘a district judge who has just denied a habeas petition . . . will have an intimate knowledge of both the record and the relevant law,’” the district judge is, at that point, often best able to determine whether to issue the COA.).

A certificate of appealability may be issued “only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). A petitioner must “sho[w]

that reasonable jurists could debate whether (or, for that matter, agree that) the petition should have been resolved in a different manner or that the issues presented were ‘adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.’” *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000). In this case, the Court concludes that reasonable jurists would not debate the Court’s conclusion that the petition does not present a claim upon which habeas relief may be warranted. Therefore, the Court denies a certificate of appealability.

III. CONCLUSION

Petitioner has not established that he is in the State of Michigan’s custody in violation of the Constitution or laws of the United States.

Accordingly, it is **ORDERED** that the petition for a writ of habeas corpus is **DENIED** and the matter is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a certificate of appealability is **DENIED**.

s/Paul D. Borman
PAUL D. BORMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: December 2, 2008

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Copies of this Order were served on the attorneys of record by electronic means or U.S. Mail on December 2, 2008.

s/Denise Goodine
Case Manager