

Amendments of Rules 1.109, 2.102, 2.104, 2.106, 2.107, 2.117, 2.119, 2.403, 2.503, 2.506, 2.508, 2.518, 2.602, 2.603, 2.621, 3.101, 3.104, 3.203, 3.205, 3.210, 3.302, 3.607, 3.613, 3.614, 3.705, 3.801, 3.802, 3.805, 3.806, 4.201, 4.202, 4.303, 4.306, 5.001, 5.104, 5.105, 5.107, 5.108, 5.113, 5.117, 5.118, 5.119, 5.120, 5.125, 5.126, 5.132, 5.162, 5.202, 5.203, 5.205, 5.302, 5.304, 5.307, 5.308, 5.309, 5.310, 5.311, 5.313, 5.402, 5.404, 5.405, 5.409, 5.501, and 5.784 and Addition of Rule 3.618 of the Michigan Court Rules

To read ADM File No. 2002-37, dated March 20, 2019, visit <http://courts.michigan.gov/courts/michigansupremecourt> and click “Administrative Matters & Court Rules” and “Proposed & Recently Adopted Orders on Admin Matters.”

### Proposed Administrative Order to Require E-Filing Access Plans (Dated February 27, 2019)

AO No. 2019-XX—Trial Court Requirements for Providing Meaningful Access to the Court for Mandated Electronic Filers

To ensure that those individuals required to electronically file court documents have meaningful access to Michigan courts, the Michigan Supreme Court adopts this order requiring courts that seek permission to mandate that all litigants e-file to first submit an e-Filing Access Plan for approval by the State Court Administrative Office.

Each plan must conform to the model promulgated by the state court administrator and ensure access to at least one computer workstation per county. The plan shall be submitted to and approved by the State Court Administrative Office as a local administrative order under MCR 8.112. The State Court Administrative Office may revoke approval of an e-Filing Access Plan due to litigant grievances.

A copy of this order will be given to the Secretary of the State Bar and to the State Court Administrator so that they can make the notifications specified in MCR 1.201. Comments on the proposal may be sent to the Supreme Court Clerk in writing or electronically by May 1, 2019, at P.O. Box 30052, Lansing, MI 48909, or [ADMcomment@courts.mi.gov](mailto:ADMcomment@courts.mi.gov). When filing a comment, please refer to ADM File No. 2002-37. Your comments and the comments of others will be posted under the chapter affected by this proposal at Proposed & Recently Adopted Orders on Admin Matters page.

#### APPENDIX

State Court Administrative Office  
Model Local Administrative Order XX—e-Filing Access Plan

[LOCAL COURT LETTERHEAD]

Administrative Order [year] – [number]

#### E-FILING ACCESS PLAN

This e-Filing Access Plan is intended to ensure meaningful access to court services for litigants who are unable to remotely file court documents electronically when a court seeks to mandate electronic filing for all filers. The purpose of this plan is to ensure that a court can show it will provide sufficient assistance to litigants. This plan is based on the premise that the majority of filers that need assistance with access to electronic filing are self-represented litigants. This plan does not address the needs of litigants deemed exempt from e-filing.

#### IT IS ORDERED:

##### Section I. Needs Assessment

###### A. Self-Represented Litigant Data

The court will provide self-represented litigants service and access to e-filing computer workstations to electronically file documents in the court. The court has used the e-Filing Workstation Calculator available at [link] to estimate the number of workstations necessary to support the number of self-represented litigants who may come to the courthouse to file. The court's completed calculator is attached as Addendum 1.

###### B. Government Agencies

The court has identified that the following government agencies routinely file documents with the court: *[List government agencies such as law enforcement, Michigan Department of Health and Human Services, Michigan Department of Corrections, etc.]*. The court has consulted with each government agency listed above and established that it is capable of e-filing court documents. Additionally, the court has consulted with law enforcement agencies specifically regarding e-filing citations.

- o The following law enforcement agency(ies) are exempt from e-filing citations *[Name the specific law enforcement agency(ies) that are exempt from e-filing. If no law enforcement agencies are exempt, delete this section.]*:

o

##### Section II. e-Filing Assistance Resources

###### A. Access to Computer Workstations

No less than *[Insert number or workstations identified by calculator available at this [link]. If the calculator returns an estimate of zero computer workstations, the court must identify computer workstations that self-represented litigants may be referred to below and may delete this sentence.]* computer workstations will be available to litigants for the purposes of e-filing court documents. Where possible, computer workstations will be located in the courthouse. Computer workstations are available in the following locations. *[List and describe all available computer workstations that self-represented litigants may use to electronically file court documents, including courthouse workstations specifically for that purpose, court clerk workstations that can be made available as necessary, self-help centers in the courthouse or county, and entities with which the court*

**has a memorandum of understanding, such as libraries, universities, senior centers, community centers, etc. If entities with which the court has a memorandum of understanding are included, a copy of the executed memorandum of understanding must be attached. At least one computer workstation per county must be identified. Multi-county jurisdictions must have more than one computer workstation per jurisdiction. The court may include other resources not listed here.].**

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.

Computer workstations will meet or exceed the capabilities of the configurations recommended on the MiFILE web page available at <http://www.mifile.info/mifile-pricing/>.

#### **B. Access to Assistance in e-Filing Documents**

The court will assist individuals who need help electronically filing documents in the following ways.

- o Assistance with using the court's electronic equipment such as computers, scanners, and printers includes: **[List and describe the written materials, tutorial videos, clerk assistance, etc. that the court provides to assist litigants with using or troubleshooting the technology necessary to e-file.].**
- o
- o
- o
- o Assistance for completing e-filing tasks includes: **[List and describe the written materials, tutorial videos, clerk assistance, etc. available to assist self-represented litigants in using the MiFILE program interface.].**
- o ImageSoft Inc. MiFILE Customer Care at 855-959-8868.
- o THIS IS A PLACEHOLDER FOR MiFILE TRAINING VIDEO LOCATION
- o Electronic mail address Support@TrueFiling.com
- o
- o

#### **Section III. Training**

The court is committed to training its court staff to provide meaningful access to the court. When the court provides training, it will include a component on ensuring self-represented litigants have access to e-filing resources. The court will work with the State Court Administrative Office (SCAO) and Michigan Judicial Institute to ensure that all employees are trained on e-filing access policy and process.

#### **Section IV. Public Notification and Evaluation of e-Filing Access Plan**

##### **A. e-Filing Access Plan Approval and Notification**

This e-Filing Access Plan has been approved by the State Court Administrative Office. The court will post its e-Filing Access Plan on its public website (if available) or public notification area

within the courthouse and will make copies of the plan available upon request.

##### **B. Evaluation and Review of the e-Filing Access Plan**

One year after the effective date of this local administrative order and every three years thereafter, the court will assess whether its e-Filing Access Plan needs to be updated. Review of the following areas may indicate a need to update the e-Filing Access Plan:

- Number of litigants requesting access to computer workstations
- Number of litigants requesting assistance using computer workstations
- Number of litigants requesting procedural assistance electronically filing documents in the court
- Changes in the entities with which the court has a Memorandum of Understanding for the purposes of e-filing
- Changes in the Memorandum of Understanding for the entity with which the court has a relationship to assist with e-filing
- Feedback from litigants
- Feedback from court staff
- Changes to the e-filing initiative statewide or locally
- Problems that have arisen since implementation of the above plan

##### **C. Grievance Process**

The court is committed to addressing grievances regarding access to electronic filing assistance promptly and thoroughly.

Specific issues regarding e-filing access must be submitted to the chief judge, court administrator, and State Court Administrative Office by completing form SCAO XX. The court will respond in writing to your grievance using SCAO XXb within five business days.

Effective Date:

Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Chief Judge Signature: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **Establishment of Court Security Committees**

(Dated March 13, 2019)

The issue of courthouse security is of vital importance to ensure the safety of the public, litigants, and the judicial employees of this state. Therefore, it is ordered that each chief judge or, in any facility with multiple chief judges, one chief judge as designated by consensus of the chief judges, establish a standing courthouse security committee to be chaired by the chief judge or his/her designee. The members of the committee shall include representatives of the court's funding unit, local law enforcement, the Clerk of Court, and other facility stakeholders. The courthouse security committee is responsible for creating and promoting policies and procedures to improve the safety and security of the courthouse.

Each court shall submit to the State Court Administrative Office (SCAO) a local administrative order that establishes the courthouse security committee in accordance with the model local administrative order developed by the SCAO. Courts with multiple chief judges in one location and courts that have multiple locations must follow the instructions provided by the SCAO for establishing the standing

courthouse security committee. In developing the security committee, courts are directed to work with local funding units and to collaborate with other entities in shared facilities, where appropriate.

Proposed local administrative orders must be submitted to the SCAO no later than September 1, 2019.

### Proposed Amendment of Rule 1.109 of the Michigan Court Rules (Dated February 27, 2019)

On order of the Court, this is to advise that the Court is considering an amendment of Rule 1.109 of the Michigan Court Rules. Before determining whether the proposal should be adopted, changed before adoption, or rejected, this notice is given to afford interested persons the opportunity to comment on the form or the merits of the proposal or to suggest alternatives. The Court welcomes the views of all. This matter also will be considered at a public hearing. The notices and agendas for public hearings are posted at Administrative Matters & Court Rules page.

Publication of this proposal does not mean that the Court will issue an order on the subject, not does it imply probable adoption of the proposal in its present form.

[Additions to the text are indicated in underlining and deleted text is shown by strikeover.]

Rule 1.109 Court Records Defined; Document Defined; Filing Standards; Signatures; Electronic Filing and Service; Access

(A)–(F) [Unchanged.]

(G) Electronic Filing and Service.

(1)–(2) [Unchanged.]

(3) Scope and Applicability.

(a)–(f) [Unchanged.]

(g) Where electronic filing is mandated, a party may file paper documents with that court and be served with paper documents according to subrule (G)(6)(a)(ii) if the party can demonstrate good cause for an exemption. A party who is confined by governmental authority, including but not limited to an individual who is incarcerated in a jail or prison facility, detained in a juvenile facility, or committed to a medical or mental health facility, has good cause for an exemption.

(i) A request for an exemption must be filed with the court where the individual's case will be or has been filed. The request must be on a form approved by the State Court Administrative Office and verified under MCR 1.109(D)(3). There is no fee for the request.

(ii) The request must specify the reasons that prevent the individual from filing electronically. The individual may file supporting documents along with the request for the court's consideration.

(iii) A judge must review the request and any supporting documentation and issue an order granting or denying the request within two business days of the date the request was filed.

(iv) The clerk of the court must promptly mail the order to the individual. The clerk must place the request, any supporting documentation, and the order in the case file. If there is no case file, the documents must be maintained in a group file.

(v) An exemption granted under this rule is valid only for the court in which it was filed and for the life of the case unless the individual exempted from filing electronically registers with the electronic-filing system. In that event, the individual waives the exemption and becomes subject to the rules of electronic filing and the requirements of the electronic-filing system. An individual who waives an exemption under this rule may file another request for exemption.

(4)–(7) [Unchanged.]

STAFF COMMENT: The proposed amendment of Rule 1.109 of the Michigan Court Rules is an expected progression necessary for design and implementation of the statewide electronic-filing system. This particular amendment will assist in implementing the goals of the project.

The staff comment is not an authoritative construction by the Court. In addition, adoption of an amendment in no way reflects a substantive determination by this Court.

A copy of this order will be given to the Secretary of the State Bar and to the State Court Administrator so that they can make the notifications specified in MCR 1.201. Comments on the proposal may be sent to the Supreme Court Clerk in writing or electronically by May 1, 2019, at P.O. Box 30052, Lansing, MI 48909, or ADMcomment@courts.mi.gov. When filing a comment, please refer to ADM File No. 2002-37. Your comments and the comments of others will be posted under the chapter affected by this proposal at Proposed & Recently Adopted Orders on Admin Matters page.

### Proposed Rescission of Rule 8.123 of the Michigan Court Rules (Dated March 20, 2019)

On order of the Court, this is to advise that the Court is considering a rescission of Rule 8.123 of the Michigan Court Rules. Before determining whether the proposal should be adopted, changed before adoption, or rejected, this notice is given to afford interested persons the opportunity to comment on the form or the merits of the proposal or to suggest alternatives. The Court welcomes the views of all. This matter will also be considered at a public hearing. The notices and agendas for public hearings are posted at Administrative Matters & Court Rules page.

Publication of this proposal does not mean that the Court will issue an order on the subject, nor does it imply probable adoption of the proposal in its present form.

[Additions to the text are indicated in underlining and deleted text is shown by strikeover.]

Rule 8.123—Counsel Appointments; Procedure and Records

~~(A) Applicability. This rule applies to all trial courts, which means all circuit courts, district courts, probate courts, and municipal courts.~~

(B) ~~Plan for Appointment.~~ Each trial court must adopt a local administrative order that describes the court's procedures for selecting, appointing, and compensating counsel who represent indigent parties in that court.

(C) ~~Approval by State Court Administrator.~~ The trial court must submit the local administrative order to the State Court Administrator for review pursuant to MCR 8.112(B)(3). The State Court Administrator shall approve a plan if its provisions will protect the integrity of the judiciary.

(D) ~~Required Records.~~ At the end of each calendar year, a trial court must compile an annual electronic report of the total public funds paid to each attorney for appointments by that court.

~~This subrule applies to appointments of attorneys in any capacity, regardless of the indigency status of the represented party. Trial courts that contract for services to be provided by an affiliated group of attorneys may treat the group as a single entity when compiling the required records.~~

~~The records required by this subrule must be retained for the period specified by the State Court Administrative Office's General Schedule 16.~~

(E) ~~Public Access to Records.~~ The records must be available at the trial court for inspection by the public, without charge. The court may adopt reasonable access rules, and may charge a reasonable fee for providing copies of the records.

(F) ~~Reports to State Court Administrator.~~ A trial court must submit its annual electronic report to the state court administrator in the form specified by the state court administrator. When requested by the state court administrator, a trial court must cooperate in providing additional data on an individual attorney, judge, or attorney group for a period specified by the request, including the number of appointments by each judge, the number of appointments received by an individual attorney or attorney group, and the public funds paid for appointments by each judge.

STAFF COMMENT: Because counsel appointment plan review and data collection regarding payments for appointed counsel is now, by statute, a requirement of the Michigan Indigent Defense Commission under MCL 780.989 and MCL 780.993, this proposed amendment would rescind MCR 8.123, which requires certain data be collected from courts and plans for appointment be approved by SCAO.

The staff comment is not an authoritative construction by the Court. In addition, adoption of an amendment in no way reflects a substantive determination by this Court.

A copy of this order will be given to the Secretary of the State Bar and to the State Court Administrator so that they can make the notifications specified in MCR 1.201. Comments on the proposal may be sent to the Supreme Court Clerk in writing or electronically by July 1, 2019, at P.O. Box 30052, Lansing, MI 48909, or ADMcomment@courts.mi.gov. When filing a comment, please refer to ADM File No. 2018-27. Your comments and the comments of others will be posted under the chapter affected by this proposal at Proposed & Recently Adopted Orders on Admin Matters page.

## Amendment of Rule 2.513 of the Michigan Court Rules (Dated March 13, 2019)

On order of the Court, notice of the proposed changes and an opportunity for comment in writing and at a public hearing having been provided, and consideration having been given to the comments received, the following amendment of Rule 2.513 of the Michigan Court Rules is adopted, effective May 1, 2019.

[Additions to the text are indicated in underlining and deleted text is shown by strikeover.]

### Rule 2.513 Conduct of Jury Trial

(A) Preliminary Instructions. After the jury is sworn and before evidence is taken, the court shall orally provide the jury with pre-trial instructions reasonably likely to assist in its consideration of the case. Such instructions, at a minimum, shall communicate the duties of the jury, trial procedure, and the law applicable to the case as are reasonably necessary to enable the jury to understand the proceedings and the evidence. The jury also shall be orally instructed about the elements of all civil claims or all charged offenses, as well as the legal presumptions and burdens of proof. The court shall also provide each juror with a written copy of such instructions. MCR 2.512(D)(2) does not apply to such preliminary instructions.

(B)–(M) [Unchanged.]

(N) Final Instructions to the Jury.

(1) Before closing arguments, the court must give the parties a reasonable opportunity to submit written requests for jury instructions. Each party must serve a copy of the written requests on all other parties. The court must inform the parties of its proposed action on the requests before their closing arguments. After closing arguments are made or waived, the court must orally instruct the jury as required and appropriate, but at the discretion of the court, and on notice to the parties, the court may orally instruct the jury before the parties make closing arguments. After jury deliberations begin, the court may give additional instructions that are appropriate.

(2) Solicit Questions about Final Instructions. As part of the final jury instructions, the court shall advise the jury that it may submit in a sealed envelope given to the bailiff any written questions about the jury instructions that arise during deliberations. ~~Upon concluding the final instructions~~ After orally delivering the final jury instructions, the court shall invite the jurors to ask any questions in order to clarify the instructions before they retire to deliberate.

If questions arise, the court and the parties shall convene, in the courtroom or by other agreed-upon means. The question shall be read into the record, and the attorneys shall offer comments on an appropriate response. The court may, in its discretion, provide the jury with a specific response to the jury's question, but the court shall respond to all questions asked, even if the response consists of a directive for the jury to continue its deliberations.

(3)–(4) [Unchanged.]

(O)–(P) [Unchanged.]

STAFF COMMENT: The amendment of MCR 2.513 explicitly provides that a court must orally recite its preliminary and final jury instructions for the jury (in addition to providing them in writing). The amendment clarifies that even though a juror is entitled to a written set of instructions, the judge must still orally instruct the jury. This amendment conforms the rule to the opinion issued by the Court in *People v Traver*.

The staff comment is not an authoritative construction by the Court. In addition, adoption of a new rule or amendment in no way reflects a substantive determination by this Court.

### Amendment of Rule 3.993 of the Michigan Court Rules

(Dated March 13, 2019)

On order of the Court, notice of the proposed changes and an opportunity for comment in writing and at a public hearing having been provided, and consideration having been given to the comments received, the following amendment of Rule 3.993 of the Michigan Court Rules is adopted, effective May 1, 2019.

[Additions to the text are indicated in underlining and deleted text is shown by strikeover.]

#### Rule 3.993 Appeals

(A) The following orders are appealable to the Court of Appeals by right:

(1)–(2) [Unchanged.]

(3) any order required by law to be appealed to the Court of Appeals, ~~and~~

(4) any order involving an Indian child that is subject to potential invalidation under § 39 of the Michigan Indian Family Preservation Act, MCL 712B.1 et seq. or § 1914 of the Indian Child Welfare Act, 25 USC 1901 et seq., which includes, but is not limited to, an order regarding:

(a) recognition of the jurisdiction of a tribal court pursuant to MCL 712B.7, MCL 712B.29, or 25 USC 1911;

(b) transfer to tribal court pursuant to MCL 712B.7 or 25 USC 1911;

(c) intervention pursuant to MCL 712B.7 or 25 USC 1911;

(d) extension of full faith and credit to public acts, records, and judicial proceedings of an Indian tribe pursuant to MCL 712B.7 or 25 USC 1911;

(e) removal of a child from the home, placement into foster care, or continuance of an out-of-home placement pursuant to MCL 712B.9, MCL 712B.15, MCL 712B.25, MCL 712B.29, or 25 USC 1912;

(f) termination of parental rights pursuant to MCL 712B.9, MCL 712B.15, or 25 USC 1912;

(g) appointment of counsel pursuant to MCL 712B.21 or 25 USC 1912;

(h) examination of reports pursuant to MCL 712B.11 or 25 USC 1912;

(i) voluntary consent to or withdrawal of a voluntary consent to a foster care placement or to a termination of parental right pursuant to MCL 712B.13, MCL 712B.25, MCL 712B.27, or 25 USC 1913;

(j) foster care, pre-adoptive, or adoptive placement of an Indian child pursuant to MCL 712B.23; and

(54) any final order.

(B)–(C) [Unchanged.]

STAFF COMMENT: The amendment of MCR 3.993, recommended by the State Bar of Michigan, establishes a list of specific orders that can be appealed by right regarding an Indian child subject to a child protective proceeding.

The staff comment is not an authoritative construction by the Court. In addition, adoption of an amendment in no way reflects a substantive determination by this Court.

### Amendment of Canon 7 of the Michigan Code of Judicial Conduct

(Dated March 13, 2019)

On order of the Court, notice of the proposed changes and an opportunity for comment in writing and at a public hearing having been provided, and consideration having been given to the comments received, the following amendment of Canon 7 of the Code of Judicial Conduct is adopted, effective May 1, 2019.

[Additions to the text are indicated in underlining and deleted text is shown by strikeover.]

#### Canon 7.

A Judge or a Candidate for Judicial Office Should Refrain from Political Activity Inappropriate to Judicial Office

A. [Unchanged.]

B. Campaign Conduct:

(1) [Unchanged.]

(2) These provisions govern a candidate, including an incumbent judge, for a judicial office:

(a) [Unchanged.]

(b) A candidate may establish committees of responsible persons to secure and manage the expenditure of funds for the campaign and to obtain public statements of support (including support from lawyers) for the candidacy.

(c) Such committees may solicit and accept ~~are prohibited from soliciting~~ campaign contributions from the public, including lawyers, as permitted by law. ~~in excess of \$100 per lawyer, but may solicit public support from lawyers. It is not a violation of this provision for a committee, in undertaking solicitations that are not directed exclusively to lawyers but may in fact go to lawyers who are members of a group or found on a mailing list, to solicit more than \$100 per person, provided that the following disclaimer appears on the letter or on a response card, in~~

~~print that is at least the same size as the remainder of the print in the letter or the response card:~~

~~“Canon 7 of the Michigan Code of Judicial Conduct prohibits a judicial campaign committee from soliciting more than \$100 per lawyer. If you are a lawyer, please regard this as informative and not a solicitation for more than \$100.”~~

(d)–(g) [Unchanged.]

(3) [Unchanged.]

C. [Unchanged.]

STAFF COMMENT: The amendment of Canon 7 of the Code of Judicial Conduct explicitly allows judicial campaign solicitation as permitted by law, eliminates the \$100 per lawyer limitation, and removes the disclaimer requirement. This change brings Michigan’s canons into conformity with the majority of states that have moved away from solicitation restrictions and instead opted to refer to statutory campaign provisions.

The staff comment is not an authoritative construction by the Court. In addition, adoption of an amendment in no way reflects a substantive determination by this Court.

### Amendment of Rule 7.2 of the Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct (Dated March 27, 2019)

On order of the Court, notice of the proposed changes and an opportunity for comment in writing and at a public hearing having been provided, and consideration having been given to the comments received, the following amendment of Rule 7.2 of the Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct is adopted, effective May 1, 2019.

[Additions to the text are indicated in underlining and deleted text is shown by strikeover.]

Rule 7.2 Advertising

(a)–(c) [Unchanged.]

(d) For purposes of media advertising, services of a lawyer or law firm that are advertised under the heading of a phone number, web address, icon, or trade name shall identify the name and contact information of at least one lawyer responsible for the content of the advertisement. The identification shall appear on or in the advertisement itself; or, if that is not practical due to space limitations, the identification shall be prominently displayed on the home page of the law firm’s website and any other website used by the law firm for advertising purposes.

Comment: [Unchanged.]

STAFF COMMENT: The amendment of MRPC 7.2 requires lawyer media advertisements under the heading of a phone number, web address, icon, or trade name to identify the name and contact information of at least one lawyer responsible for the content of the advertisement. The identification shall appear in the advertisement or, if not practical because of size restrictions, on the home page of the law firm’s website.

The staff comment is not an authoritative construction by the Court. In addition, adoption of a new rule or amendment in no way reflects a substantive determination by this Court.

### Appointment of Chief Judge of the 27th District Court (Dated March 20, 2019)

On order of the Court, effective immediately, the Honorable Elizabeth DiSanto is appointed chief judge of the 27th District Court for the remainder of a term ending December 31, 2019.

### Supreme Court Appointments to the Court Reporting and Recording Board of Review (Dated March 20, 2019)

On order of the Court, pursuant to MCR 8.108(G)(2)(a), the following appointments are made to the Court Reporting and Recording Board of Review, effective April 1, 2019:

The Honorable Jennifer Callahan (probate court judge) is appointed for a first full term that will expire on March 31, 2023.

The Honorable Timothy Kelly (district court judge) is appointed for a first full term that will expire on March 31, 2023.

Melinda I. Dexter (official court reporter) is reappointed for a second full term that will expire on March 31, 2023.

Kristine Fuller (official court recorder) is reappointed for a first full term that will expire on March 31, 2023.

### Assignment of Business Court Judges (Dated March 20, 2019)

On order of the Court, effective April 1, 2019, the following judges are assigned to serve in the role of business court judge for six-year terms expiring April 1, 2025.

Judge Donna B. Howard, 2nd Circuit Court (Berrien County)  
 Judge Brian R. Sullivan, 3rd Circuit Court (Wayne County)  
 Judge Edward Ewell, Jr., 3rd Circuit Court (Wayne County)  
 Judge Lita M. Popke, 3rd Circuit Court (Wayne County)  
 Judge Richard N. LaFlamme, 4th Circuit Court (Jackson County)  
 Judge James M. Alexander, 6th Circuit Court (Oakland County)  
 Judge Martha D. Anderson, 6th Circuit Court (Oakland County)  
 Judge F. Kay Behm, 7th Circuit Court (Genesee County)  
 Judge Alexander C. Lipsey, 9th Circuit Court (Kalamazoo County)  
 Judge M. Randall Jurrens, 10th Circuit Court (Saginaw County)  
 Judge Timothy G. Hicks, 14th Circuit Court (Muskegon County)  
 Judge Richard L. Caretti, 16th Circuit Court (Macomb County)  
 Judge Kathryn A. Viviano, 16th Circuit Court (Macomb County)  
 Judge Christopher P. Yates, 17th Circuit Court (Kent County)  
 Judge Jon A. Van Allsburg, 20th Circuit (Ottawa County)  
 Judge Archie C. Brown, 22nd Circuit Court (Washtenaw County)  
 Judge Joyce A. Draganchuck, 30th Circuit Court (Ingham County)  
 Judge Daniel J. Kelly, 31st Circuit Court (St. Clair County)  
 Judge Brian K. Kirkham, 37th Circuit Court (Calhoun County)  
 Judge Daniel S. White, 38th Circuit Court (Monroe County)  
 Judge Michael P. Hatty, 44th Circuit Court (Livingston County)

VIVIANO, J., not participating in the assignment of business court judges for the 16th Circuit Court.