

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

LARRY DARNELL JONES,

Petitioner,

v.

Civil No. 2:13-CV-13864
HONORABLE DENISE PAGE HOOD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

STEVEN RIVARD,

Respondent,

_____ /

**OPINION AND ORDER HOLDING IN ABEYANCE THE PETITION FOR WRIT
OF HABEAS CORPUS AND ADMINISTRATIVELY CLOSING THE CASE.**

Larry Darnell Jones, (“Petitioner”), confined at the St. Louis Correctional Facility in St. Louis, Michigan, has filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. In his application, filed *pro se*, petitioner challenges his convictions for armed robbery, M.C.L.A. 750.529; carjacking, M.C.L.A. 750.529a; assault with intent to rob while armed, M.C.L.A. 750.89; possession of a firearm in the commission of a felony, M.C.L.A. 750.227b; and assault with a dangerous weapon, M.C.L.A. 750.82. Petitioner has also filed a motion to stay the habeas corpus proceedings (Doc. No. 1, Pg ID 18) and hold the petition in abeyance to permit him to return to the state courts to present additional claims that have not been exhausted with the state courts. For the reasons stated below, the Court holds the petition in abeyance and stays the proceedings under the terms outlined in this opinion to permit petitioner to return

to the state courts to exhaust his additional claims. The Court will also administratively close the case.

I. Background

Petitioner was convicted of the above offenses following a jury trial in the Wayne County Circuit Court. Petitioner's conviction was affirmed on appeal. *People v. Jones*, No. 287201 (Mich.Ct.App. February 15, 2011); *lv. Den.* 490 Mich. 897, 804 N.W.2d 555 (2011).

On December 26, 2012, petitioner filed a post-conviction motion for relief from judgment pursuant to M.C.R. 6.500, *et. Seq.*, which remains pending in the Wayne County Circuit Court.

On September 5, 2013, petitioner filed this application for writ of habeas corpus, in which he seeks habeas relief on the claims that he raised in the Michigan appellate courts on his direct appeal.¹

Petitioner has also filed a motion to hold the habeas petition in abeyance so that he can completely exhaust on state post-conviction review additional claims that have not been exhausted with the state courts.

II. Discussion

A federal district court has the authority to abate or dismiss a federal habeas action pending resolution of state post-conviction proceedings. See

¹ Under the prison mailbox rule, this Court assumes that petitioner filed his habeas petition on September 5, 2013, the date that it was signed and dated. See *Neal v. Bock*, 137 F. Supp. 2d 879, 882, fn. 1 (E.D. Mich. 2001).

Brewer v. Johnson, 139 F. 3d 491, 493 (5th Cir. 1998). However, in order to stay federal proceedings and hold a habeas petition in abeyance pending resolution of state court proceedings, there must be exceptional or unusual circumstances. See *Sitto v. Bock*, 207 F. Supp. 2d 668, 676 (E.D. Mich. 2002); *Hudson v. Martin*, 68 F. Supp. 2d 798, 800 (E.D. Mich. 1999). A federal district court is authorized to stay fully exhausted federal habeas petitions pending the exhaustion of other claims in the state courts. See *Nowaczyk v. Warden, New Hampshire State Prison*, 299 F.3d 69, 77-79 (1st Cir. 2002)(holding that district courts should “take seriously any request for a stay.”); *Anthony v. Cambra*, 236 F. 3d 568, 575 (9th Cir. 2000); See also *Bowling v. Haeberline*, 246 Fed. Appx. 303, 306 (6th Cir. 2007)(A habeas court is entitled to delay a decision in a habeas petition that contains only exhausted claims “when considerations of comity and judicial economy would be served”)(quoting *Nowaczyk*, 299 F. 3d at 83).

In the present case, petitioner has filed a post-conviction motion for relief from judgment, which remains pending in the trial court. The general rule is that a habeas petition should be denied on exhaustion grounds where the petitioner’s state post-conviction motion remains pending in the state courts. See e.g. *Juliano v. Cardwell*, 432 F. 2d 1051, 1051 (6th Cir. 1970). Moreover, if the trial court denies petitioner’s motion for relief from judgment, he still has the ability to appeal the denial of his post-conviction motion to the Michigan appellate courts. Denial of a motion for relief from judgment is reviewable by the Michigan Court of

Appeals and the Michigan Supreme Court upon the filing of an application for leave to appeal. M.C.R. 6.509; M.C.R. 7.203; M.C.R. 7.302. See *Wagner v. Smith*, 581 F. 3d 410, 414 (6th Cir. 2009). A criminal defendant in Michigan has six months from the denial of a motion for relief from judgment by the trial court to file an application for leave to appeal with the Michigan Court of Appeals. M.C.R. 6.509 (A); M.C.R. 7.205(F)(3).

The Court grants petitioner's motion to hold the petition in abeyance while he returns to the state courts to exhaust his additional claims. The outright dismissal of the petition, albeit without prejudice, might result in preclusion of consideration of the petitioner's claims in this Court due to the expiration of the one year statute of limitations contained in the Antiterrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act (AEDPA). See 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1). A common circumstance calling for abating a habeas petition arises when the original petition was timely filed, but a second, exhausted habeas petition would be time barred by the AEDPA's statute of limitations. See *Hargrove v. Brigano*, 300 F. 3d 717, 720-21 (6th Cir. 2002).

The U.S. Supreme Court suggested that a habeas petitioner who is concerned about the possible effects of his state post-conviction filings on the AEDPA's statute of limitations could file a "protective" petition in federal court, as petitioner apparently did here, and then ask for the petition to be held in abeyance pending the exhaustion of state post-conviction remedies. See *Pace v.*

DiGuglielmo, 544 U.S. 408, 416 (2005)(citing *Rhines v. Weber*, 544 U.S. 269 (2005)). A federal court may stay a federal habeas petition and hold further proceedings in abeyance pending resolution of state court post-conviction proceedings, if there is good cause for failure to exhaust and the unexhausted claims are not “plainly meritless.” *Rhines*, 544 U.S. at 278.

Petitioner’s claims do not appear to be “plainly meritless.” *Wagner v. Smith*, 581 F. 3d at 419. Further, petitioner may assert that he did not previously raise these claims in the state courts due to the ineffective assistance of appellate counsel. *Id.*, at 419, nn. 4 and 5. Finally, it does not appear that petitioner has engaged in “intentionally dilatory tactics.”

When a district court determines that a stay is appropriate pending exhaustion of state court remedies, the district court “should place reasonable time limits on a petitioner’s trip to state court and back.” *Rhines*, 544 U.S. at 278. To ensure that petitioner does not delay in exhausting his state court remedies, the Court imposes upon petitioner time limits within which he must proceed. See *Palmer v. Carlton*, 276 F.3d 777, 781 (6th Cir. 2002). Petitioner must present his claims in state court by filing a post-conviction motion for relief from judgment with the state trial court within sixty days from the date of this Order, which he has already done. See *id.* Further, he must ask this Court to lift the stay within sixty days of exhausting his state court remedies. See *id.* “If the conditions of the stay are not met, the stay may later be vacated *nunc pro tunc* as of the date the stay

was entered, and the petition may be dismissed.” *Palmer*, 276 F. 3d at 781 (internal quotation omitted).

The exhaustion doctrine, in the context of habeas cases, turns upon an inquiry of whether there are available state court procedures for a habeas petitioner to exhaust his or her claims. See *Adams v. Holland*, 330 F. 3d 398, 401 (6th Cir. 2003). Petitioner has an available state court remedy with which to exhaust his claims. Exhausting state court remedies in this case requires the filing of a post-conviction motion for relief from judgment with the trial court under Michigan Court Rule 6.500, *et. seq.*, which petitioner has already done. See *Wagner*, 581 F. 3d at 419. A trial court is authorized to appoint counsel for petitioner, seek a response from the prosecutor, expand the record, permit oral argument, and hold an evidentiary hearing. M.C.R. 6.505-6.507, 6.508 (B) and (C). Denial of a motion for relief from judgment is reviewable by the Michigan Court of Appeals and the Michigan Supreme Court upon the filing of an application for leave to appeal. M.C.R. 6.509; M.C.R. 7.203; M.C.R. 7.302. See *Nasr v. Stegall*, 978 F. Supp. 714, 717 (E.D. Mich. 1997). Petitioner, in fact, is required to appeal the denial of his post-conviction motion to the Michigan Court of Appeals and the Michigan Supreme Court in order to properly exhaust any claims that he is raising in his post-conviction motion. See *e.g. Mohn v. Bock*, 208 F. Supp. 2d 796, 800 (E.D. Mich. 2002).

III. ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the proceedings are **STAYED** and the Court will hold the habeas petition in abeyance. Petitioner must file a motion for relief from judgment in state court within sixty days of receipt of this order, which he has already done. After petitioner fully exhausts his new claims, he shall file an amended petition that includes the new claims within sixty days after the conclusion of his state court post-conviction proceedings, along with a motion to lift the stay. Failure to do so will result in the Court lifting the stay and adjudicating the merits of the claims raised in petitioner's original habeas petition.

To avoid administrative difficulties, the Court **ORDERS** the Clerk of Court to **CLOSE** this case for statistical purposes only. Nothing in this order or in the related docket entry shall be considered a dismissal or disposition of this matter. *See Sitto*, 207 F. Supp. 2d at 677.

It is further **ORDERED** that upon receipt of a motion to reinstate the habeas petition following exhaustion of state remedies, the Court may order the Clerk to reopen this case for statistical purposes.

s/Denise Page Hood
HON. DENISE PAGE HOOD
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DATED: September 30, 2013

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon counsel of record on September 30, 2013, by electronic and/or ordinary mail.

s/Carolyn Ciesla for LaShawn Saulsberry
Case Manager