Walls v. Romanoski Doc. 23

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

THOMAS WALLS,

	Petitioner,		Case Number: 2:06-CV-14203
V.			HON. ARTHUR J. TARNOW
KENNETH RON	MANOWSKI,		
	Respondent.		
		/	

OPINION AND ORDER GRANTING PETITIONER'S MOTION TO REOPEN CASE, DIRECTING SERVICE, AND REQUIRING RESPONSIVE PLEADING

Petitioner Thomas Walls, a state inmate incarcerated at the Gus Harrison Correctional Facility in Adrian, Michigan, filed a *pro se* habeas corpus petition pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. The Court determined that the petition contained an unexhausted claim and stayed further proceedings so that Petitioner could pursue exhaustion in state court. The Court directed that the petition would be stayed provided that Petitioner: (i) presented his claims in state court within sixty days of the Court's Order staying the petition; and (ii) asked the Court to lift the stay within sixty days of exhausting his state court remedies. Now before the Court is Petitioner's Motion to Reopen.

In his Motion to Reopen, Petitioner states that he has now exhausted his state court remedies by completing collateral review in state court. On September 2, 2008, he filed a motion for relief from judgment in the trial court, which was denied. *People v. Walls*, No. 02-184922 (Oakland County Circuit Court Nov. 14, 2008). He filed an application for leave to appeal in the Michigan Court of Appeals, which was denied. *People v. Walls*, No. 290108 (Mich. Ct. App. Apr. 15, 2009). Petitioner then filed an application for leave to appeal in the

Michigan Supreme Court, which was denied on November 23, 2009. People v. Walls, No.

138924 (Mich. Nov. 23, 2009). Petitioner then filed the pending Motion to Reopen.

Petitioner filed his motion for relief from judgment in the trial court within the sixty days

prescribed in the Court's Order and also returned to this Court within sixty days of exhausting

his state court remedies. The Court, therefore, will grant the Motion to Reopen.

For the forgoing reasons, **IT IS ORDERED** that Petitioner's Motion to Reopen is

GRANTED and the Clerk of Court is directed to **REOPEN** this matter.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court serve a copy of the amended

petition, Motion to Reopen, and a copy of this Order on Respondent and on the Attorney General

for the State of Michigan as provided in Rule 4, Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Respondent file an answer responding to the

allegations of the petition in accordance with Rule 5, Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, by

March 20, 2010.

S/Arthur J. Tarnow

Arthur J. Tarnow

United States District Judge

Dated: January 20, 2010

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record on

January 20, 2010, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

S/Catherine A. Pickles

Judicial Secretary

2