

It is Clark's burden to establish that he has properly and fully exhausted his available state court remedies with respect to his habeas claims for relief. *See Prather v. Rees*, 822 F.2d 1418, 1420 n.3 (6th Cir. 1987) (citing *Hopkins v. State*, 524 F.2d 473, 474-75 (5th Cir. 1975)). But for each ground asserted, Clark indicates on the face of the Petition that his post-conviction proceedings remain pending. (*See* ECF DKT #1 at 6-7). Because Clark has not fully exhausted his state court remedies, his § 2254 petition must be dismissed.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Clark's petition for a writ of habeas corpus is dismissed pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 cases. Clark's motion to consolidate is moot and denied as such. (ECF DKT #4).

The Court certifies pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3) that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith, and there is no basis upon which to issue a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253; Fed. R. App. P. 22(b).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Christopher A. Boyko
CHRISTOPHER A. BOYKO
United States District Judge

Dated: August 13, 2019