

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

WILLIAM WHITE, #715935,

Petitioner,

v.

CASE NO. 2:16-CV-13177  
HONORABLE PAUL D. BORMAN

THOMAS WINN,

Respondent.

---

**OPINION AND ORDER DISMISSING THE PETITION FOR A WRIT OF  
HABEAS CORPUS, DENYING A CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY,  
AND DENYING LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS ON APPEAL**

**I. Introduction**

Michigan prisoner William White (“Petitioner”) has filed a pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254 challenging his Saginaw County Circuit Court no contest plea to second-degree murder for which he was sentenced to 30 to 50 years imprisonment in 2014. In his pleadings, Petitioner raises claims concerning the factual basis for his plea, the effectiveness of trial counsel, and the voluntariness of his plea. Respondent has filed an answer to the petition contending that it should be dismissed because the claims are unexhausted and lack merit. For the reasons stated herein, the Court dismisses without prejudice the petition for a writ of habeas corpus. The Court also denies a certificate of appealability and denies leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal.

## II. Analysis

A prisoner filing a petition for a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. §2254 must first exhaust all state remedies. *See O'Sullivan v. Boerckel*, 526 U.S. 838, 845 (1999) (“state prisoners must give the state courts one full opportunity to resolve any constitutional issues by invoking one complete round of the State’s established appellate review process”); *Rust v. Zent*, 17 F.3d 155, 160 (6th Cir. 1994). The claims must be “fairly presented” to the state courts, meaning that the petitioner must have asserted both the factual and legal bases for the claims in the state courts. *McMeans v. Brigano*, 228 F.3d 674, 681 (6th Cir. 2000); *see also Williams v. Anderson*, 460 F.3d 789, 806 (6th Cir. 2006) (citing *McMeans*). The claims must also be raised in the state courts as federal constitutional issues. *Koontz v. Glossa*, 731 F.2d 365, 368 (6th Cir. 1984). A Michigan prisoner must raise each issue he seeks to present in a federal habeas proceeding to both the Michigan Court of Appeals and the Michigan Supreme Court to satisfy the exhaustion requirement. *Hafley v. Sowders*, 902 F.2d 480, 483 (6th Cir. 1990); *Welch v. Burke*, 49 F. Supp. 2d 992, 998 (E.D. Mich. 1999). The burden is on the petitioner to prove exhaustion. *Rust*, 17 F.3d at 160.

Petitioner has not met his burden. The record indicates that he raised his habeas claims in a delayed application for leave to appeal to the Michigan Court of Appeals on direct appeal, but his application was dismissed as untimely. *People v. White*, No. 325215 (Mich. Ct. App. Jan. 21, 2015). He then filed an application for leave to appeal with the Michigan Supreme Court, which was denied in a standard order. *People v. White*, 498

with the Michigan Supreme Court, which was denied in a standard order. *People v. White*, 498 Mich. 892, 869 N.W.2d 621 (2015). Because Petitioner's appeal to the Michigan Court of Appeals was dismissed as untimely, none of his claims were fairly presented to all levels of the Michigan courts for purposes of satisfying the exhaustion requirement. *See McBride v. Woods*, No. 06-CV-10170, 2010 WL 3419507, \*3 (E.D. Mich. Aug. 27, 2010) (citing cases). A habeas petitioner "cannot circumvent the exhaustion requirement by failing to comply with state procedural rules." *Coleman v. Mitchell*, 244 F.3d 533, 538 (6th Cir. 2001).

Petitioner has an available state court remedy to challenge his conviction which must be exhausted before he seeks federal habeas review. He may file a motion for relief from judgment pursuant to Michigan Court Rule 6.500 with the state trial court and then pursue his claims through the state appellate courts as necessary. Federal law provides that a habeas petitioner is only entitled to relief if he can show that the state court adjudication of his claims resulted in a decision that was contrary to, or involved an unreasonable application of, clearly established federal law as determined by the Supreme Court of the United States. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(d). The state courts must first be given a fair opportunity to rule upon Petitioner's claims before he can present them in federal court. Otherwise, the Court cannot apply the standard found at 28 U.S.C. § 2254.

A federal court has discretion to stay a mixed habeas petition, containing both exhausted and unexhausted claims, to allow a petitioner to present the unexhausted claims

to the state courts in the first instance and then return to federal court on a perfected petition. *Rhines v. Weber*, 544 U.S. 269, 276 (2005). Stay and abeyance is available only in “limited circumstances” such as when the one-year statute of limitations applicable to federal habeas actions poses a concern, and when the petitioner demonstrates “good cause” for the failure to exhaust state court remedies before proceeding in federal court and the unexhausted claims are not “plainly meritless.” *Id.* at 277.

Petitioner does not request a stay nor indicate that his circumstances justify a stay. Moreover, a stay is inappropriate. All of Petitioner’s habeas claims are unexhausted. The Court cannot ordinarily stay a petition containing only unexhausted claims. In such a case, a non-prejudicial dismissal of the petition is appropriate. *See Hines v. Romanowski*, No. 2:14-CV-13983, 2014 WL 5420135, \*2 (E.D. Mich. Oct. 22, 2014) (dismissing case where all claims were unexhausted); *Wilson v. Warren*, No. 06-CV-15508, 2007 WL 37756, \*2 (E.D. Mich. Jan. 4, 2007) (“a stay of petitioner’s application for a writ of habeas corpus would be inappropriate, because all of petitioner’s claims are unexhausted and thus, the Court lacks jurisdiction over the petition while the petitioner pursues his claims in state court”); *accord Rasberry v. Garcia*, 448 F.3d 1150, 1154 (9th Cir. 2006) (*Rhines* stay and abeyance rule does not apply to a petition alleging only unexhausted claims); *United States v. Hickman*, 191 F. App’x 756, 757 (10th Cir. 2006) (“[t]raditionally, when a petition contains entirely unexhausted state claims, the petition would be dismissed without prejudice....”); *McDonald v. Bell*, No. 1:06-cv-406, 2009 WL

1525970 (W.D. Mich. June 1, 2009) (concluding that the stay and abeyance procedure does not apply to a petition containing only unexhausted claims); *Mimms v. Russell*, No. 1:08-cv-79, 2009 WL 890509 (S.D. Ohio March 31, 2009) (habeas petition subject to dismissal where petitioner did not exhaust state court remedies on any of his habeas claims); *Murphy v. Feneis*, No. 07-153, 2007 WL 2320540, \*7 (D. Minn. Aug.10, 2007) (“Given the narrow issue before the Supreme Court regarding mixed petitions, this Court refuses to extend *Rhines* to allow a court to stay a habeas petition, so that a petitioner can exhaust his state remedies, where, as here, the petition contains only unexhausted claims.”). Given such circumstances, a stay is unwarranted and a non-prejudicial dismissal of the habeas petition is appropriate.

### **III. Conclusion**

For the reasons stated, the Court concludes that Petitioner has not exhausted his claims in the state courts and that a stay of the proceedings is unwarranted. Accordingly, the Court **DISMISSES WITHOUT PREJUDICE** the petition for a writ of habeas corpus. The Court makes no determination as to the merits of Petitioner’s claims.

Before Petitioner may appeal this decision, a certificate of appealability must issue. 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 court denies relief on procedural grounds without addressing the merits, 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. The Court also **DENIES** leave to proceed in forma pauperis on appeal as an appeal cannot be taken in good faith. *See* FED. R. APP. P. 24(a). This case is closed.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**



PAUL D. BORMAN  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APR 25 2017

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_