

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
NORTHERN DIVISION

EDWARD JAMES CROMER,

Petitioner,

Case No. 2:12-cv-324

v.

Honorable R. Allan Edgar

ROBERT NAPEL,

Respondent.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

**OPINION**

This is a habeas corpus action brought by a state prisoner pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2241. On October 4, 2012, the court noted that Petitioner was a state prisoner seeking relief from the judgment of a state court, so that Petitioner's claims were governed by 28 U.S.C. § 2254. Therefore, the court ordered Petitioner to file an amended petition for habeas corpus relief pursuant to § 2254 on the form petition provided by this court. Petitioner now states that he is not challenging his state court conviction, but is instead challenging the decision of the parole board not to provide a public hearing regarding parole on cases where the prisoner is serving a life sentence, such as Petitioner.

Petitioner claims that he is constitutionally entitled to a parole hearing in Michigan. To sustain such a claim, petitioner must first establish that eligibility for parole is a recognized liberty interest, entitled to protection by the Due Process Clause. *Meachum v. Fano*, 427 U.S. 215, 224 (1976); *see Board of Pardons v. Allen*, 482 U.S. 369 (1987). A prisoner's unilateral expectation, particularly where prison officials retain complete discretion regarding an ultimate determination,

does not create a constitutionally protected entitlement or liberty interest. *Board of Regents v. Roth*, 408 U.S. 564, 577 (1972).

Liberty interests may arise from the Constitution itself or from the provisions of state law. *See Hewitt v. Helms*, 459 U.S. 460, 466 (1983). A prisoner has no constitutional or inherent right to be released on parole before the expiration of the prisoner's sentence. *Greenholz v. Inmates of the Nebraska Penal & Correctional Complex*, 442 U.S. 1, 7 (1979). The state is therefore free to institute parole systems, but it has no duty to do so. *Id.*; *see Rose v. Haskins*, 388 F.2d 91, 93 (6th Cir. 1968). A prisoner has a liberty interest in the possibility of parole if, but only if, state law creates a legitimate expectation of parole release by the use of mandatory language limiting the discretion of the Parole Board. *See Allen*, 482 U.S. at 373-75. In the absence of a state-created liberty interest, the Parole Board can deny release on parole for any reason or no reason at all, and the Due Process Clause has no application. *See Inmates of Orient Correctional Inst. v. Ohio State Adult Parole Auth.*, 929 F.2d 233, 236 (6th Cir. 1991).

In numerous cases, this court has reviewed Michigan law and has found a complete absence of mandatory language or the imposition of substantive predicates restricting the Parole Board's discretion. Michigan statutes merely define those prisoners not eligible for parole and list factors that the Parole Board may or may not consider in its decision to grant or deny parole, without directing a specific result. *See* MICH. COMP. LAWS §§ 791.233b, .234, .235. No statutory provision requires parole for any eligible prisoner under any circumstances. The statute makes release on parole expressly discretionary. MICH. COMP. LAWS § 791.234(7).<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Michigan parole statutes have been amended several times in recent years. The statutory citations contained above are to the present codification of the parole law. None of the recent amendments are material to the issues now before the court. Release on parole has always

Relying upon these provisions of Michigan law, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals has authoritatively held that the Michigan system does not create a liberty interest in parole. *Sweeton v. Brown*, 27 F.3d 1162, 1164-65 (6th Cir. 1994) (en banc). In unpublished decisions following *Sweeton*, the Sixth Circuit has repeatedly held that particular parts of Michigan's statutory parole scheme do not create a liberty interest in parole. See *Fifer v. Michigan Dep't of Corr.*, No. 96-2322, 1997 WL 681518, at \*1 (6th Cir. Oct. 30, 1997); *Moran v. McGinnis*, No. 95-1330, 1996 WL 304344, at \*2 (6th Cir. June 5, 1996); *Vertin v. Gabry*, No. 94-2267, 1995 WL 613692, at \*1 (6th Cir. Oct. 18, 1995); *Leaphart v. Gach*, No. 95-1639, 1995 WL 734480, at \*2 (6th Cir. Dec. 11, 1995), cert. denied, 522 U.S. 1057 (1998); *Janiskee v. Michigan Dep't of Corr.*, No. 91-1103, 1991 WL 76181, at \*1 (6th Cir. May 9, 1991); *Neff v. Johnson*, No. 92-1818, 1993 WL 11880, at \*1 (6th Cir. Jan. 21, 1993); *Haynes v. Hudson*, No. 89-2006, 1990 WL 41025, at \*1 (6th Cir. April 10, 1990). Further, the Michigan Supreme Court has recognized that there is no liberty interest in parole under the Michigan system. *Glover v. Michigan Parole Bd.*, 596 N.W.2d 598, 603-04 (Mich. 1999).

Until a petitioner has served his maximum sentence, he has no reasonable expectation of liberty. In the absence of a liberty interest, even an allegation of arbitrary or capricious denial of release on parole states no federal claim. See *Haynes*, 1990 WL 41025, at \*1. The discretionary parole system in Michigan holds out "no more than a mere hope that the benefit will be obtained." *Greenholz*, 442 U.S. at 11. The Michigan Parole Board's failure or refusal to consider petitioner for parole, therefore, implicates no federal right. In the absence of a liberty interest, Petitioner fails to state a claim for a violation of his procedural due process rights. In light of the foregoing, the Court will summarily dismiss Petitioner's application because it fails to raise a meritorious federal claim.

---

been discretionary under Michigan law.

Under 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2), the Court must determine whether a certificate of appealability should be granted. A certificate should issue if Petitioner has demonstrated a “substantial showing of a denial of a constitutional right.” 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). This Court’s dismissal of Petitioner’s action under Rule 4 of the Rules Governing § 2254 Cases is a determination that the habeas action, on its face, lacks sufficient merit to warrant service. It would be highly unlikely for this Court to grant a certificate, thus indicating to the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals that an issue merits review, when the Court has already determined that the action is so lacking in merit that service is not warranted. *See Love v. Butler*, 952 F.2d 10 (1st Cir. 1991) (it is “somewhat anomalous” for the court to summarily dismiss under Rule 4 and grant a certificate); *Hendricks v. Vasquez*, 908 F.2d 490 (9th Cir. 1990) (requiring reversal where court summarily dismissed under Rule 4 but granted certificate); *Dory v. Comm’r of Corr. of New York*, 865 F.2d 44, 46 (2d Cir. 1989) (it was “intrinsicly contradictory” to grant a certificate when habeas action does not warrant service under Rule 4); *Williams v. Kullman*, 722 F.2d 1048, 1050 n.1 (2d Cir. 1983) (issuing certificate would be inconsistent with a summary dismissal).

The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals has disapproved issuance of blanket denials of a certificate of appealability. *Murphy v. Ohio*, 263 F.3d 466 (6th Cir. 2001). Rather, the district court must “engage in a reasoned assessment of each claim” to determine whether a certificate is warranted. *Id.* at 467. Each issue must be considered under the standards set forth by the Supreme Court in *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473 (2000). *Murphy*, 263 F.3d at 467. Consequently, this Court has examined each of Petitioner’s claims under the *Slack* standard. Under *Slack*, 529 U.S. at 484, to warrant a grant of the certificate, “[t]he petitioner must demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court’s assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong.” *Id.* “A

petitioner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that . . . jurists could conclude the issues presented are adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further.” *Miller-El v. Cockrell*, 537 U.S. 322, 327 (2003). In applying this standard, the Court may not conduct a full merits review, but must limit its examination to a threshold inquiry into the underlying merit of Petitioner’s claims. *Id.*

The Court finds that reasonable jurists could not conclude that this Court’s dismissal of Petitioner’s claims was debatable or wrong. Therefore, the Court will deny Petitioner a certificate of appealability.

A Judgment and Order consistent with this Opinion will be entered.

Dated: 11/2/2012

/s/ R. Allan Edgar  
R. Allan Edgar  
United States District Judge