Sedlak v. Terris Doc. 4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

D	0	CE	D	SE		ΙΛ	K
Г	\cdot	GE	\boldsymbol{r}	SE	U	${}_{\perp}$	۱N.

Petitioner,

V.

CASE NO. 2:14-CV-10839 HONORABLE GEORGE CARAM STEEH

J. A. TERRIS,

Respondent.	

OPINION AND ORDER DISMISSING THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AND DENYING A CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY

The Court has before it federal prisoner Roger Sedlak's *pro* se petition for a writ of habeas corpus filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. The petitioner did not pay the required filing fee when he filed his habeas petition, nor did he submit an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. See 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a); 28 U.S.C. § 1915; Rule 3 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases. The Court, therefore, issued a deficiency order on February 24, 2014 requiring him to either pay the filing fee or submit a properly completed *in forma pauperis* application. The order provided that if he did not do so within 21 days, his case would be dismissed. The time for submitting the filing fee or required information has elapsed and the petitioner has failed to correct the deficiency. Accordingly, the Court **DISMISSES WITHOUT PREJUDICE** the petition for a writ of habeas corpus. The Court makes no determination as to the merits of the claims.

Before the petitioner may appeal the Court's decision, a certificate of appealability must issue. See 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(a); Fed. R. App. P. 22(b). A certificate of appealability may issue "only if the applicant has made a substantial showing of the denial

of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). When a federal court denies relief on

procedural grounds without addressing the merits of a habeas petition, a certificate of

appealability should issue if it is shown that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether

the petitioner states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right and that jurists of

reason would find it debatable whether the court was correct in its procedural ruling. Slack

v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484-85 (2000). Reasonable jurists could not debate the

correctness of the Court's procedural ruling. Accordingly, the Court **DENIES** a certificate

of appealability. This case is CLOSED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 1, 2014

s/George Caram Steeh
GEORGE CARAM STEEH
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Copies of this Order were served upon attorneys of record on April 1, 2014, by electronic and/or ordinary mail and also on Roger Sedlak #63014066, Milan Federal Correctional Institution, Inmate Mail/Parcels, P.O. Box 1000, Milan, MI 48160.

s/Barbara Radke Deputy Clerk

2