Pouncy v. Palmer Doc. 97

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

OMAR RASHAD POUNCY,

Petitioner,

Case No. 13-cv-14695
Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

v.

CARMEN D. PALMER,

Respondent.
_____/

ORDER DENYING PETITIONER'S MOTION TO REDUCE TIME TO APPEAL ORDER GRANTING BOND TO FOURTEEN DAYS PER RESPONDENT'S REQUEST (ECF # 96)

On January 11, 2016, this Court granted a conditional writ of habeas corpus to Petitioner Omar Pouncy ("Petitioner"). (*See* ECF #76.[1]) The Court thereafter entered an order granting Petitioner's motion for release on bond (the "Bond Order"). (*See* ECF #93.) This Court stayed the effect of the Bond Order for twenty-one days. (*See id.*) Petitioner now moves the Court to reduce the length of the stay of the Bond Order to fourteen days (the "Motion"). (*See* ECF #96.) The Court **DENIES** the Motion.

The Court chose to stay the Bond Order for twenty-one days – even though Respondent sought a stay of only fourteen days – because the Court concluded that

[1] The Court initially granted Petitioner relief on January 8, 2016. (*See* ECF #74.) It then issued an Amended Opinion and Order on January 11, 2016, that corrected two non-substantive errors in the Court's initial ruling. (*See* ECF #76.)

Dockets.Justia.com

the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit may require more than fourteen days to complete a careful review of the Bond Order and the parties' arguments in opposition to and support of that Order. The Court stands by that conclusion.

Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the Motion (ECF #96) is **DENIED**.

s/Matthew F. Leitman
MATTHEW F. LEITMAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: March 14, 2016

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on March 14, 2016, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Monda
Case Manager
(313) 234-5113