

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

KEVIN CHORAZYCZEWSKI,

Petitioner,

Case No. 2:15-cv-12754

Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

v.

SHERMAN CAMPBELL,

Respondent.

**OPINION AND ORDER REQUIRING PETITIONER’S COUNSEL
TO CLARIFY THE ISSUES BEING RAISED IN THE PETITION
FOR WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS**

Kevin Chorazyczewski, (“petitioner”), seeks the issuance of a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. In his application, filed by attorney Frank G. Becker, petitioner challenges his conviction for unarmed robbery, M.C.L.A. § 750.530; and being a third felony habitual offender, M.C.L.A. § 769.11. The petition for writ of habeas corpus is twenty four pages long and divided into forty seven paragraphs containing numerous factual allegations. Petitioner’s counsel, however, does not specify the claims that he wishes to raise in his petition, and the Court is having difficulty discerning the precise claims Petitioner seeks to raise.

Where, as here, there is confusion about the claims being raised by a habeas petitioner, a district court should order the habeas petitioner to articulate the specific claims that he or she wishes to raise in his or her petition. *See Franklin v. Rose*, 765 F. 2d 82, 85 (6th Cir. 1985).

Petitioner's counsel is **ORDERED** to file a statement specifically identifying the claims raised in the petition. Counsel should not provide any additional legal arguments. The Court simply wants a list precisely identifying each specific claim presented. Petitioner shall file the list by February 17, 2017.

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

Dated: February 2, 2017

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on February 2, 2017, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

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