Administrative Order No. 2020-17 Priority Treatment and New Procedure for Landlord/Tenant Cases (Dated June 9, 2020)

Since the early days of the pandemic, state and national authorities have imposed restrictions on the filing of many landlord/tenant cases. As those restrictions are lifted and courts return to full capacity and reopen facilities to the public, many will experience a large influx of landlord/tenant case filings. Traditionally, the way most courts processed these types of cases relied heavily on many cases being called at the same time in the same place, resulting in large congregations of individuals in enclosed spaces. That procedure is inconsistent with the restrictions that will be in place in many courts over the coming weeks and months as a way to limit the possibility of transmission of COVID-19. In addition, courts are required to comply with a phased expansion of operations as provided under Administrative Order No. 2020-14, which may also impose limits on the number of individuals that may congregate in public court spaces.

Therefore, the Court adopts this administrative order under 1963 Const, Art VI, Sec 4, which provides for the Supreme Court's general superintending control over all state courts, directing courts to process landlord/tenant cases using a prioritization approach. This approach will help limit the possibility of further infection while ensuring that landlord/tenant cases are able to be filed and adjudicated efficiently. All courts having jurisdiction over landlord/tenant cases must follow policy guidelines established by the State Court Administrative Office. Courts should be mindful of the limitations imposed by federal law (under the CARES Act) as these cases are filed and processed, and follow the guidance in Administrative Order No. 2020-8 in determining the appropriate timing for beginning to consider these cases.

For courts that are able to begin conducting proceedings, the following provisions apply to landlord/tenant actions.

(1) Each Trial Court with jurisdiction over cases filed under the Summary Proceedings Act, MCL 600.5701, *et seq.*, may accept new filings and begin to schedule hearings as follows:

   a. In a manner that is consistent with the Return to Full Capacity (RTFC) guidelines referenced in Administrative Order No. 2020-14,

   b. In a manner that is consistent with each court's most recently-approved local administrative order regarding Return to Full Capacity.

(2) When a trial court resumes scheduling hearings for recovery of possession of premises under MCL 600.5714 and MCL 600.5775, the following operational priorities apply:

   a. First priority: complaints alleging illegal activity under MCL 600.5714(1)(b) and complaints alleging extensive and continuing physical injury to the premises under MCL 600.5714(1)(d).

   b. Second priority: complaints alleging nonpayment of rent for 120 days or more.

   c. Third priority: complaints alleging nonpayment of rent for 90 days or more.

   d. Fourth priority: complaints alleging nonpayment of rent for 60 days or more.

   e. Fifth priority: complaints alleging nonpayment of rent for 30 days or more.

   f. Courts should proceed to a subsequent priority when all cases in the higher priority have been scheduled for hearing.

   g. Instead of setting many cases for one hearing time as has traditionally been common, each case must be scheduled for a particular date and time (whether held in-person or remotely) to allow in-person proceedings to be held safely.

   h. A filer who filed a case before April 16, 2020 (the date Administrative Order No. 2020-8 entered) must update the factual allegations in the complaint and file the verification form required by Administrative Order No. 2020-8 before a hearing will be scheduled. The court shall not require an additional filing fee.

(3) Trial Courts must schedule cases filed for an alleged termination of tenancy (as opposed to cases for nonpayment of rent) pursuant to MCL 600.5714 during or after the fifth level of priority described above or after the statutorily-required notice period has elapsed, whichever comes later.

(4) Courts are authorized to proceed with these actions by way of remote participation tools, and encouraged to do so to the greatest extent possible. Administrative Order No. 2020-6 requires that the court scheduling a remote hearing must "verify that all participants are able to proceed in this manner." Therefore, the summons for each case filed under the Summary Proceedings Act must provide the date and time for remote participation in the scheduled hearing. If a remote hearing is scheduled for the first proceeding, the defendant received personal service pursuant to MCR 2.105(A), and the defendant fails to appear, a default may enter. If a remote hearing is scheduled for the first proceeding and the defendant fails to appear and has not been served under MCR 2.105(A), the court may not enter a default but must reschedule the hearing and mail notice for that rescheduled hearing as an in-person proceeding. Under these conditions, a notice of rescheduled hearing mailed by the court within 24 hours is sufficient notice of the rescheduled hearing, notwithstanding any other court rule. Other parties or participants may proceed remotely.

(5) All local administrative orders requiring a written answer pursuant to MCL 600.5735(4) are suspended.[1] Unless otherwise provided by this order, a court must comply with MCR 4.201 with regard to summary proceedings.

1. The local administrative orders include: 1st District Court (Monroe County); 2a District Court (Lenawee County); 12th District Court (Jackson County); 18th District Court (City of Westland); 81st District Court (Alcona, Arenac, Iosco, and Oscoda Counties); 82nd District (Ogemaw County); and 95b District Court (Dickinson and Iron Counties).

(6) At the initial hearing noticed by the summons, the court must conduct a pretrial hearing consistent with SCAO guidance. At the pretrial hearing the parties must be verbally informed of all of the following:
   a. Defendant has the right to counsel. MCR 4.201(F)(2).
   b. The Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS), the local Coordinated Entry Agency (CEA), or the federal Help for Homeless Veterans program may be able to assist the parties with payment of some or all of the rent due.
   c. Defendants DO NOT need a judgment to receive assistance from MDHHS or the local CEA. The Summons and Complaint from the court case are sufficient.[2]
   d. The availability of the Michigan Community Dispute Resolution Program (CDRP) and local CDRP Office as a possible source of case resolution. The court must contact the local CDRP to coordinate resources. The CDRP may be involved in the resolution of Summary Proceedings cases to the extent that the chief judge of each court determines, including conducting the pretrial hearing.
   e. The possibility of a Conditional Dismissal pursuant to MCR 2.602 if approved by all parties. The parties must be provided with a form to effectuate such Conditional Dismissal.

(7) The pretrial required under this subsection may be conducted by the assigned judge, a visiting judge appointed by SCAO, a magistrate (as long as that magistrate is a lawyer) or a CDRP mediator.

(8) Except as provided below, all Summary Proceeding Act cases must be adjourned for seven days after the pretrial hearing is conducted. MCL 600.5732. Any party who does not appear at the adjourned date will be defaulted. Cases need not be adjourned for seven days if: the plaintiff dismisses the complaint, with or without prejudice, without any conditions, or if defendant was personally served under MCR 2.105(A) and fails to appear.

(9) The court may require remote participation in the second, and any subsequent, proceedings, and the court must verify that participants are able to proceed in that manner under Administrative Order No. 2020-6. If a party cannot appear remotely, in-person proceedings must be scheduled that provide for the safety of all parties.

(10) MCR 4.201(F)(3) is temporarily suspended to the extent that a jury demand must be made in the first response. Instead, if the defendant wants a jury trial, he or she must demand it within seven days of the first response. The jury trial fee, if not waived by the court, must be paid when the demand is made.

This order is effective until further order of the Court.

2. See State Emergency Relief Manual, Relocation Services, ERM 303, ERB 2019-005, Page 3 of 7.

Amendment of Administrative Order No. 2020-17 Priority Treatment and New Procedure for Landlord/Tenant Cases (Dated June 24, 2020)

On order of the Court, the following amendment of Administrative Order No. 2020-17 is adopted, effective immediately.

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

Administrative Order No. 2020-17— Priority Treatment and New Procedure for Landlord/Tenant Cases

Since the early days of the pandemic, state and national authorities have imposed restrictions on the filing of many landlord/tenant cases. As those restrictions are lifted and courts return to full capacity and reopen facilities to the public, many will experience a large influx of landlord/tenant case filings. Traditionally, the way most courts processed these types of cases relied heavily on many cases being called at the same time in the same place, resulting in large congregations of individuals in enclosed spaces. That procedure is inconsistent with the restrictions that will be in place in many courts over the coming weeks and months as a way to limit the possibility of transmission of COVID-19. In addition, courts are required to comply with a phased expansion of operations as provided under Administrative Order No. 2020-14, which may also impose limits on the number of individuals that may congregate in public court spaces.

Therefore, the Court adopts this administrative order under 1963 Const, Art VI, Sec 4, which provides for the Supreme Court's general superintending control over all state courts, directing courts to process landlord/tenant cases using a prioritization approach. This approach will help limit the possibility of further infection while ensuring that landlord/tenant cases are able to be filed and adjudicated efficiently. All courts having jurisdiction over landlord/tenant cases must follow policy guidelines established by the State Court Administrative Office. Courts should be mindful of the limitations imposed by federal law (under the CARES Act) as these cases are filed and processed, and follow the guidance in Administrative Order No. 2020-8 in determining the appropriate timing for beginning to consider these cases.

For courts that are able to begin conducting proceedings, the following provisions apply to landlord/tenant actions.

(1) Each Trial Court with jurisdiction over cases filed under the Summary Proceedings Act, MCL 600.5701, *et seq.*, may accept new filings and begin to schedule hearings as follows:
   a. In a manner that is consistent with the Return to Full Capacity (RTFC) guidelines referenced in Administrative Order No. 2020-14,
   b. In a manner that is consistent with each court's most recently-approved local administrative order regarding Return to Full Capacity.

(2) When a trial court resumes scheduling hearings for recovery of possession of premises under MCL 600.5714 and MCL 600.5775, the following operational priorities apply:

a. First priority: complaints alleging illegal activity under MCL 600.5714(1)(b), ~~and~~ complaints alleging extensive and continuing physical injury to the premises under MCL 600.5714 (1)(d), complaints alleging that the tenant or someone in the tenant's household has caused or threatened physical injury to an individual while on the leased property under MCL 600.5714(1)(e), and complaints alleging that the tenant is trespassing or squatting under MCL 600.5714(1)(f).

b. Second priority: complaints alleging nonpayment of rent for 120 days or more.

c. Third priority: complaints alleging nonpayment of rent for 90 days or more.

d. Fourth priority: complaints alleging nonpayment of rent for 60 days or more.

e. Fifth priority: complaints alleging nonpayment of rent for 30 days or more.

f. Sixth Priority: All cases described in First Priority through Fifth Priority that are filed after a court has moved to the next priority designation, and any case for recovery of possession of premises where the complaint alleges nonpayment of rent of less than 30 days. Cases filed in a lower numerical priority designation (e.g., a second priority case filed during a court's priority five period) shall be given first consideration in order of priority.

g~~f~~. Courts should proceed to a subsequent priority when all cases in the higher priority have been scheduled for hearing.

h~~g~~. Instead of setting many cases for one hearing time as has traditionally been common, each case must be scheduled for a particular date and time (whether held in-person or remotely) to allow in-person proceedings to be held safely.

i~~h~~. A filer who filed a case before April 16, 2020 (the date Administrative Order No. 2020-8 entered) must update the factual allegations in the complaint and file the verification form required by Administrative Order No. 2020-8 before a hearing will be scheduled. The form will allow a filer to indicate that the case was filed before the moratorium period began and therefore, even if a covered dwelling, is not foreclosed from proceeding. If the filer must remove any fees or costs that are prohibited under the CARES Act, the filer must file an amended complaint for any action that proceeds during the moratorium period. The court shall not require an additional filing fee.

(3) Except as otherwise provided, ~~T~~trial ~~C~~courts must schedule cases filed for an alleged termination of tenancy (as opposed to cases for nonpayment of rent) pursuant to MCL 600.5714 during or after the fifth level of priority described above or after the statutorily-required notice period has elapsed, whichever comes later. A court may consider a termination case before the fifth level of priority upon motion by plaintiff alleging that there is good cause to consider the case earlier for reasons of public safety or other just cause, including but not limited to matters brought under MCL 600.5775.

(4) Courts are authorized to proceed with these actions by way of remote participation tools, and encouraged to do so to the greatest extent possible. Administrative Order No. 2020-6 requires that the court scheduling a remote hearing must "verify that all participants are able to proceed in this manner." Therefore, the summons for each case filed under the Summary Proceedings Act must provide the date and time for remote participation in the scheduled hearing. In addition, the summons must be accompanied by any written information about the availability of counsel and housing assistance information as provided by legal aid or local funding agencies. If a remote hearing is scheduled for the first proceeding, the defendant received personal service pursuant to MCR 2.105(A), and the defendant fails to appear, a default may enter. If a remote hearing is scheduled for the first proceeding and the defendant fails to appear and has not been served under MCR 2.105(A), the court may not enter a default but must reschedule the hearing and mail notice for that rescheduled hearing as an in-person proceeding. Under these conditions, a notice of rescheduled hearing mailed by the court within 24 hours after the initial hearing date is sufficient notice of the rescheduled hearing, notwithstanding any other court rule. Other parties or participants may proceed remotely.

(5) All local administrative orders requiring a written answer pursuant to MCL 600.5735(4) are suspended.[1] Unless otherwise provided by this order, a court must comply with MCR 4.201 with regard to summary proceedings.

(6) At the initial hearing noticed by the summons, the court must conduct a pretrial hearing consistent with SCAO guidance. At the pretrial hearing the parties must be verbally informed of all of the following:

a. Defendant has the right to counsel. MCR 4.201(F)(2).

b. The Michigan Department of Health and Human Services (MDHHS), the local Coordinated Entry Agency (CEA), or the federal Help for Homeless Veterans program may be able to assist the parties with payment of some or all of the rent due.

1. The local administrative orders include: 1st District Court (Monroe County); 2a District Court (Lenawee County); 12th District Court (Jackson County); 18th District Court (City of Westland); 81st District Court (Alcona, Arenac, Iosco, and Oscoda Counties); 82nd District (Ogemaw County); and 95b District Court (Dickinson and Iron Counties).

c. Defendants DO NOT need a judgment to receive assistance from MDHHS or the local CEA. The Summons and Complaint from the court case are sufficient.[2]

d. The availability of the Michigan Community Dispute Resolution Program (CDRP) and local CDRP Office as a possible source of case resolution. The court must contact the local CDRP to coordinate resources. The CDRP may be involved in the resolution of Summary Proceedings cases to the extent that the chief judge of each court determines, including conducting the pretrial hearing.

e. The possibility of a Conditional Dismissal pursuant to MCR 2.602 if approved by all parties. The parties must be provided with a form to effectuate such Conditional Dismissal.

(7) The pretrial required under this subsection may be conducted by the assigned judge, a visiting judge appointed by SCAO, a magistrate (as long as that magistrate is a lawyer) or a CDRP mediator.

(8) Except as provided below, all Summary Proceeding Act cases must be adjourned for seven days after the pretrial hearing is conducted. MCL 600.5732. Any party who does not appear at the adjourned date will be defaulted. Cases need not be adjourned for seven days if: the plaintiff dismisses the complaint, with or without prejudice, and without any conditions, ~~or~~ if defendant was personally served under MCR 2.105(A) and fails to appear, or where both plaintiff and defendant are represented by counsel and a consent judgment or conditional dismissal is filed with the court. Where plaintiff and defendant are represented by counsel, the parties may submit a conditional dismissal or consent judgment in lieu of appearing personally at the second hearing.

(9) The court may require remote participation in the second, and any subsequent, proceedings, and the court must verify that participants are able to proceed in that manner under Administrative Order No. 2020-6. If a party cannot appear remotely, in-person proceedings must be scheduled that provide for the safety of all parties.

(10) MCR 4.201(F)(3) is temporarily suspended to the extent that a jury demand must be made in the first response. Instead, if the defendant wants a jury trial, he or she must demand it within seven days of the first response. The jury trial fee, if not waived by the court, must be paid when the demand is made.

(11) A court shall discontinue compliance with this order when it has proceeded through all priority phases and no longer has any landlord/tenant filings that allege a breach of contract for the time period between March 20, 2020, and June 30, 2020 (the period in which there was a statewide moratorium on evictions). At that point, the court may notify the regional administrator of its completion of the process and will not be required to return to the procedure even if a subsequent case is filed that alleges rent owing during the period of the eviction moratorium.

This order is effective until further order of the Court.

STAFF COMMENT: The amendments in this order reflect the Court's consideration of feedback provided after the initial order entered and before the eviction moratorium expired. For the convenience of the reader, an updated version of the order reflecting the amendments is attached here.

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.

Administrative Order No. 2020-18 Order Resuming Usual Computation of Days for Determination of Deadlines Applicable to the Commencement of Civil and Probate Actions (Dated June 12, 2020)

In Administrative Order No. 2020-3, the Supreme Court issued an order excluding any days that fall during the State of Emergency declared by the Governor related to COVID-19 for purposes of determining the deadline applicable to the commencement of all civil and probate case types under MCR 1.108(1). Effective Saturday, June 20, 2020, that administrative order is rescinded, and the computation of time for those filings shall resume. For time periods that started before Administrative Order No. 2020-3 took effect, the filers shall have the same number of days to submit their filings on June 20, 2020, as they had when the exclusion went into effect on March 23, 2020. For filings with time periods that did not begin to run because of the exclusion period, the filers shall have the full periods for filing beginning on June 20, 2020.

STAFF COMMENT: Note that although the order regarding computation of days entered on March 23, 2020, it excluded any day that fell during the State of Emergency declared by the Governor related to COVID-19, which order was issued on March 10, 2020. Thus, the practical effect of Administrative Order No. 2020-3 was to enable filers to exclude days beginning March 10, 2020. This timing is consistent with the executive orders entered by the Governor regarding the tolling of statutes of limitation.

Administrative Order No. 2020-19 Continuing Order Regarding Court Operations (Dated June 26, 2020)

For the last several months, courts have been operating under special rules to ensure that essential functions continue while also limiting access to physical locations as a way to limit the spread of COVID-19 for both court staff and court visitors. As courts return to full capacity it is now appropriate to revisit those early orders.

2. See State Emergency Relief Manual, Relocation Services, ERM 303, ERB 2019-005, Page 3 of 7.

In Administrative Order No. 2020-14, the Court made it clear that all courts must adopt a phased approach to a return to full capacity of operations. Courts have been submitting their required local administrative orders and are balancing protecting public health and increasing operations. The technological tools courts used to ensure access during the closure should be maintained and indeed used more frequently to rebuild capacity.

Therefore, on order of the Court:

1. Administrative Order No. 2020-2 is rescinded, with the expectation that courts shall continue to process those cases listed as essential functions in addition to other cases as courts return to full capacity under the terms of Administrative Order No. 2020-14. Courts that have progressed to Phase 3 under the Return to Full Capacity guidance document under Administrative Order No. 2020-14 shall begin holding jury trials using trial standards approved by the State Court Administrative Office. In addition, courts that are not yet at Phase 3 may proceed with jury trials upon approval from the State Court Administrative Office. Further, courts must continue to provide a method or methods for filers to submit pleadings other than by personal appearance at the court.

2. Courts shall continue to expand the use of remote participation technology (video or telephone) as much as possible to reduce any backlog and to dispose of new cases efficiently and safely. As articulated in Administrative Order No. 2020-1 and Administrative Order No. 2020-6, as courts expand their use of remote technology tools, courts must continue to verify that participants are able to proceed remotely, and should permit some participants to appear remotely even if all participants are not able to participate electronically. To enable the greatest participation possible for judicial officers, Administrative Order No. 2012-7 (which limits the circumstances under which judges may preside over remote proceedings) is suspended until further order of the Court.

3. Administrative Order No. 2020-9 adopted temporary amendments that promoted the use of electronic means to access the courts and enabled parties to proceed with litigation, as well as extended some filing deadlines. The amendments of MCR 2.002, MCR 2.107(C), MCR 3.904, and the issuance of subpoenas under MCR 2.305, MCR 2.506, MCR 2.621(C), MCR 9.112(D), MCR 9.115(I)(1), and MCR 9.212 continue in effect until further order of the Court. The time deadlines in MCR 2.102(D), MCR 2.614, MCR 3.216(G)(3), and MCR 2.411(F)(4), are extended 80 days, reflecting the period between March 24, 2020 and June 12, 2020. The time deadlines in rules regarding postjudgment motions filed in the trial court (including motions for appointment of appellate counsel) as well as circuit court appeals and appeals of agency determinations are extended for 76 days, consistent with Administrative Order No. 2020-16.

4. Administrative Order No. 2020-13 allows courts to collect certain information, including mobile phone number(s) and email addresses, to facilitate scheduling of and participation in remote hearings. The order has generated some confusion about how to handle nonconfidential information. To clarify that the form for collecting information (but not the information itself if it is contained elsewhere in a public portion of the file) is nonpublic, the administrative order is amended as follows:

~~To protect privacy and address security concerns, t~~The ~~contact information~~ form used under this administrative order to collect the information shall be confidential.

This order is effective until further order of the Court.

Proposed Amendment of Rule 2.108 of the Michigan Court Rules (Dated June 10, 2020)

On order of the Court, this is to advise that the Court is considering an amendment of Rule 2.108 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, 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 2.108 Time

(A)–(B) [Unchanged.]

(C) Effect of Particular Motions and Amendments. When a motion or an amended pleading is filed, the time for pleading set in subrule (A) is altered as follows, unless a different time is set by the court:

(1) If a motion under MCR 2.115(A) or MCR 2.116 made before filing a responsive pleading is denied, the moving party must serve and file a responsive pleading within 21 days after notice of the denial. However, if the moving party, within 21 days, files an application for leave to appeal from the order, the time is extended until 21 days after the denial of the application unless the appellate court orders otherwise.

(2)–(4) [Unchanged.]

(D)–(F) [Unchanged.]

STAFF COMMENT: The proposed amendment of MCR 2.108 would provide a timeframe for a responsive pleading when a motion for more definite statement is denied.

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 October 1, 2020, at P.O. Box 30052, Lansing, MI 48909, or ADMcomment@courts.mi.gov. When filing a comment, please refer to ADM File No. 2020-11. 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 4.202 of the Michigan Court Rules (Dated June 10, 2020)

On order of the Court, this is to advise that the amendment of Rule 4.202 of the Michigan Court Rules is adopted, effectively immediately, during the public comment period. Concurrently, individuals are invited to comment on the form or the merits of the amendment. 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.

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

Rule 4.202 Summary Proceedings: Land Contract Forfeiture

(A)–(G) [Unchanged.]

(H) Answer; Default.

(1) [Unchanged.]

(2) Default.

(a) If the defendant fails to appear, the court, on the plaintiff's motion, may enter a default and may hear the plaintiff's proofs in support of judgment. If satisfied that the complaint is accurate, the court must enter a default judgment under MCL 600.5741, and in accord with subrule (J). The ~~plaintiff must mail the~~ default judgment must be mailed to the defendant ~~and file a proof of service with the court.~~ by the court clerk and~~The default judgment~~ must inform the defendant that (if applicable)

(i)–(ii) [Unchanged.]

(b)–(c) [Unchanged.]

(3) [Unchanged.]

(I)–(L) [Unchanged.]

STAFF COMMENT: The amendment of MCR 4.202(H) makes the rule consistent with the requirements of MCR 4.201(F)(4) by requiring the court clerk to mail defendant notice of entry of a default judgment. The rule was amended previously to require plaintiff to mail a default judgment to the defendant, unlike MCR 4.201(F)(4), which was not amended. Having two different procedures for matters that are both summary proceedings has caused confusion for courts. This amendment returns the language to its previous status and makes MCR 4.201 and MCR 4.202 consistent again.

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 October 1, 2020, at P.O. Box 30052, Lansing, MI 48909, or ADMcomment@courts.mi.gov. When filing a comment, please refer to ADM File No. 2020-14. 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.

Appointment of Chief Judge of the 29th District Court (Wayne County) (Dated June 10, 2020)

On order of the Court, effective immediately, the Honorable Breeda O'Leary is appointed chief judge of the 29th District Court for a term ending December 31, 2021.