



CHRONOLOGICAL SUMMARY **OF REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY ACTION**

"This review points up the many benefits the bar can expect from the Assembly's debate and review of the items placed on its agenda. . . At a time when the profession and methods of practice are undergoing rapid change, it is essential that all segments of our association be heard. The proper forum for this is our Representative Assembly."

DANIEL M. CLARK
REPRESENTATIVE ASSEMBLY CHAIRPERSON
1977-1978



REPRESENTATIVE
ASSEMBLY

CONTENTS

SEPTEMBER, 197.....4	SEPTEMBER 20, 198413
MARCH 16, 1973.....4	JANUARY 19, 1985.....13
SEPTEMBER 13, 1973.....4	MAY 11, 1985.....13
MARCH 2, 1974.....4	SEPTEMBER 12, 1985.....13
SEPTEMBER 12, 1974.....4	JANUARY 11, 1986.....14
MARCH 15, 1975.....5	SEPTEMBER 18, 1986.....14
SEPTEMBER 18-19, 1975.....5	APRIL 4, 1987.....14
MARCH 13, 1976.....6	SEPTEMBER 17, 1987.....14
JUNE 12, 1976 (SPECIAL MEETING).....6	APRIL 23, 1988.....15
SEPTEMBER 16, 1976.....6	SEPTEMBER 29, 1988.....15
APRIL 2, 1977.....7	APRIL 22, 1989.....15
SEPTEMBER 15, 1977.....7	SEPTEMBER 21, 198916
APRIL 1, 1978.....7	APRIL 28, 1990.....16
SEPTEMBER 21, 1978.....7	APRIL 20, 1991.....17
DECEMBER 9, 1978 (SPECIAL MEETING).....8	SEPTEMBER 26, 1991.....18
MARCH 31, 1979.....8	APRIL 4, 1992.....18
SEPTEMBER 20, 1979.....8	SEPTEMBER 17, 1992.....18
JANUARY 12, 1980.....8	APRIL 24, 1993.....18
MAY 3, 1980.....9	JUNE 19, 1993 (SPECIAL MEETING).....19
SEPTEMBER 25, 1980.....9	SEPTEMBER 30, 1993.....19
JANUARY 17, 1981.....10	APRIL 23, 1994.....19
MAY 9, 1981.....10	SEPTEMBER 22, 1994.....20
SEPTEMBER 24, 1981.....11	JANUARY 14, 1995.....20
JANUARY 9, 1982.....11	APRIL 22, 1995.....20
MAY 8, 1982.....11	SEPTEMBER 21, 1995.....20
SEPTEMBER 23, 1982.....11	APRIL 27, 199620
JANUARY 15, 1983.....12	SEPTEMBER 19, 1996.....21
MAY 14, 1983.....12	APRIL 26, 199721
SEPTEMBER 29, 1983.....12	SEPTEMBER 18, 199721
JANUARY 7, 1984.....12	APRIL 25, 199822
MAY 5, 1984.....12	SEPTEMBER 17, 1998.....22

APRIL 24, 1999.....	22	APRIL 9, 2011.....	37
SEPTEMBER 16, 1999.....	22	SEPTEMBER 15, 2011.....	37
NOVEMBER 11, 1999.....	23	APRIL 21, 2012.....	38
JANUARY 22, 2000.....	23	SEPTEMBER 20, 2012.....	39
APRIL 29, 2000.....	23	APRIL 27, 2013.....	39
SEPTEMBER 21, 2000.....	24	SEPTEMBER 19, 2013.....	39
FEBRUARY 10, 2001.....	24	APRIL 26, 2014.....	39
APRIL 28, 2001.....	24	SEPTEMBER 18, 2014.....	41
SEPTEMBER 13, 2001.....	24	APRIL 25, 2015.....	41
JANUARY 26, 2002.....	24	OCTOBER 5, 2015.....	42
APRIL 27, 2002.....	25	APRIL 30, 2016.....	45
SEPTEMBER 26, 2002.....	25	SEPTEMBER 22, 2016.....	46
FEBRUARY 22, 2003.....	25	APRIL 22, 2017.....	47
APRIL 26, 2003.....	25	SEPTEMBER 28, 2017.....	47
SEPTEMBER 12, 2003.....	26	APRIL 21, 2018.....	47
NOVEMBER 13, 2003 (SPECIAL MEETING).....	26	SEPTEMBER 27, 2018.....	47
MARCH 27, 2004.....	26	APRIL 13, 2019.....	48
OCTOBER 1, 2004.....	26	SEPTEMBER 26, 2019.....	48
JANUARY 22, 2005.....	26	APRIL 25, 2020.....	48
APRIL 16, 2005.....	27	SEPTEMBER 17, 2020.....	49
SEPTEMBER 22, 2005.....	28	APRIL 24, 2021.....	50
APRIL 29, 2006.....	29	SEPTEMBER 18, 2021.....	50
SEPTEMBER 14, 2006.....	30	APRIL 9, 2022.....	51
APRIL 21, 2007.....	32	SEPTEMBER 17, 2022.....	51
SEPTEMBER 27, 2007.....	32	APRIL 29, 2023.....	51
APRIL 12, 2008.....	34	SEPTEMBER 21, 2023.....	51
SEPTEMBER 18, 2008.....	34	APRIL 20, 2024.....	52
APRIL 18, 2009.....	35	SEPTEMBER 19, 2024.....	52
SEPTEMBER 17, 2009.....	36		
MARCH 27, 2010.....	36		
SEPTEMBER 30, 2010.....	37		

SEPTEMBER, 1972

- Organizational meeting.

MARCH 16, 1973

- Approved a recommendation to the Supreme Court that all attorneys actively engaged in private practice be required to maintain a minimum malpractice insurance policy.
- Defeated a proposal which would have prohibited attorneys from making financial contributions to the campaign funds of candidates for judicial office.
- Defeated a report endorsing a new law school at Michigan State University, but supported a plan for an additional publicly supported law school to be established in the western part of the state at a later date "if the needs for new law graduates in Western Michigan" were not met.
- Supported in principle a system of merit selection of all Michigan judges and recommended the formation of a Citizens Committee on Michigan's Judiciary.
- Approved a recommendation to the Supreme Court that it amend the Code of Professional Responsibility to provide that isolated instances of negligence, unaccompanied by moral delinquency or misrepresentation or willful withholding of information, should not be a basis for discipline.

SEPTEMBER 13, 1973

- Approved a recommendation to the Supreme Court requiring registration of law students within 90 days after commencement of law school studies, to facilitate an earlier and more thorough character and fitness investigation.
- Approved a recommendation that each circuit court conduct trials five days a week from 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. except in multi-county circuits, where the court must sit regularly in more than one location.
- Approved in principle a proposal to amend the Constitution to provide for (1) appointment of all Michigan judges by the Governor from a list of nominees submitted to him by a nominating commission, and (2) requiring all judges so appointed to run against their record within a specified period following appointment.
- Approved a recommendation to the Supreme Court that the identity of an attorney with no prior disciplinary record should not be disclosed in the State Bar Journal or to the general news media if he or she is subjected to discipline less than suspension or disbarment.

MARCH 2, 1974

- Approved a petition requesting amendment of the Supreme Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan to provide that every member of the Assembly shall cast a full vote, in place of the weighted vote system then in effect.
- Approved a request that the Supreme Court Administrator, in an effort to conserve energy, direct all court personnel to cooperate with telephone inquiries.
- Adopted a proposal to authorize a study of appellate representation of indigent defendants.
- Approved a report recommending endorsement in principle of legislation, which would authorize the Supreme Court to grant immunity to witnesses in grievance proceedings, upon application by the State Bar Grievance Board, with notice to any affected law enforcement agency.
- Approved a statement that the Assembly gives its continued support to the provision of sufficient facilities, either in private or public institutions, to make quality legal education available to all qualified applicants.

SEPTEMBER 12, 1974

- Approved a report of the State Bar Committee on Character and Fitness proposing standards for its investigations.
- Approved the report of the Special Commissioner Committee on Local Bar Associations recommending standards for

recognition of local bar associations, with an amendment permitting an election of local association officers by mail ballot.

- Approved a proposal to the Supreme Court that it adopt a comprehensive rule of mutual discovery in criminal cases.
- Approved a recommendation urging the Supreme Court of Michigan to adopt the then proposed Code of Judicial Conduct, with amendments endorsed by the Board of Commissioners.
- Defeated a proposal to endorse legislation requiring certain minimum qualifications before an attorney is eligible to become a judicial candidate, including being of the age of majority and having practiced law for a minimum number of years.

MARCH 15, 1975

- Approved a proposal to furnish every member of the State Bar of Michigan with a copy of the Constitutional Oath of Office.
- Endorsed a proposed amendment to the GCR permitting execution of instruments by declaration under penalties of perjury, as an alternative to execution under oath.
- Recommended to the Board of Commissioners that the State Bar bylaws be amended to permit members of the State Bar in each circuit to vote for fewer members of the Representative Assembly than the number of seats to be filled (but not fewer than half).
- Adopted for transmittal to the Michigan Supreme Court a statement of principles and proposed rules setting maximum limits on contingency fees in all future personal injury cases.
- Endorsed the recommendation of the Committee on Criminal Jurisprudence that legislation be enacted permitting the filing of a motion to expunge a criminal record without limitation as to the offender's age.

SEPTEMBER 18-19, 1975

- Adopted in principle the concept of specialization and asked the Committee on Specialization in Legal Practice to report back with a proposal revised to provide for a stronger specialization structure. Also referred to the Specialization Committee for incorporation into its plan was a proposal from the Special Committee on Trial Advocacy Certification to create a formal specialty in that field.
- Referred to the Bar Journal Advisory Committee, for consideration of the costs involved, a proposal to permit the listing of specified biographical, educational and professional information in a lawyer's listing in the annual State Bar Directory, which would be available to the public. The Assembly also approved a companion recommendation to the Supreme Court that bold face listings be permitted in the telephone book white pages, as convenience to the public.
- Defeated a proposal from the Family Law Section for establishment of a Family Court for Michigan, incorporating family-related aspects of the proposals to the appropriate sections or committees of the State Bar for consideration and report, and to coordinate exchange of information among the involved groups.
- Recommended to the Supreme Court that it amend the Supreme Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan to provide for interim appointments to fill vacancies in the Assembly until the next election; and to provide that two consecutive unexcused absences by an Assembly member constitutes vacation of the seat, with a successor to be elected or appointed.
- Approved a recommendation to the Michigan Supreme Court that the Code of Professional Responsibility be amended to permit public disclosure of specified biographical, educational and professional information by attorneys ("lawyer advertising") in telephone directory Yellow Pages.
- Approved a recommendation granting the Rules & Calendar Committee authority to require that all proposals to be submitted to the Assembly be placed in resolution form stated in the affirmative, to limit supporting documentation to five typewritten pages, to attempt disposition of any problem not appearing to require submission to the Assembly, to refer jurisdiction now exercised by circuit and probate courts.
- Approved an effort to obtain passage of legislation permitting a grant of immunity from prosecution, under court control, for witnesses called before the State Bar Grievance Board hearings.

- Adopted a motion calling for vigorous prosecution of unauthorized practice cases.
- Defeated a proposal that insureds be given the right to choose their own counsel.
- Upheld a bylaw provision limiting public statements by committees and section councils to those not inconsistent with policy adopted by the Board of Commissioners or the Representative Assembly.
- Defeated a proposal that the membership of the Bar be polled in every instance before a public position is taken on issues "of vital interest to the Bar and the public."
- Authorized furnishing to each new member of the Bar a copy of the constitutional oath of office, suitable for framing. Present members could receive one upon request.

MARCH 13, 1976

- Adopted the recommendation of the Committee on Advertising that the Supreme Court of Michigan be petitioned for changes in the Code of Professional Responsibility permitting public disclosure by attorneys of the specific information set forth therein in a format and language uniformly applicable to all lawyers.
- Adopted the recommendation by the Assembly Rules & Calendar Committee for changes in the Assembly Permanent Rules of Procedure pertaining to the submission and consideration of items for the Assembly calendar.
- Adopted a recommendation by the Assembly Rules & Calendar Committee that the Supreme Court be petitioned to amend the Supreme Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan to provide for a procedure by which vacancies in the Assembly may be filled between elections.
- Referred to the Supreme Court Committee to review and consolidate Michigan Court Rules a proposal to recommend to the Supreme Court of Michigan amendments to GCR 519 making offers of judgment equally available to the parties asserting a claim as to the parties defending a claim.
- Adopted a proposal to petition the Supreme Court of Michigan to amend the Supreme Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan to provide that (1) absence by a member of the Assembly at two consecutive meetings without excuse shall result in the office being declared vacant and a successor appointed or elected; and that (2) whenever an incumbent member of the Representative Assembly seeks reelection the notice of election shall disclose the fact that the candidate is an incumbent and shall further disclose the candidate's attendance record at meetings of the Assembly.
- Referred to the Supreme Court Committee on Defender Services a proposal to endorse the recommendation of the Committee on Criminal Jurisprudence that any plan for representation of indigents must guarantee client selection and counsel accountability, and request for a study of the appellate defender system.
- Tabled the recommendation of the Committee on Juvenile Law that HB 4704 be opposed.

JUNE 12, 1976 (SPECIAL MEETING)

- Rejected the majority and minority reports of the State Bar Special Committee on Specialization in Legal Practice.
- Defeated reconsideration of the Representative Assembly's endorsement of the concept of specialization in legal practice passed at the September 18-19, 1975 meeting.
- Appointed a special Representative Assembly committee to further investigate the subject of specialization and in doing so, to survey the members of the Representative Assembly concerning the subject of specialization.

SEPTEMBER 16, 1976

- Approved the recommendation of the Rules & Calendar Committee that the chairperson of the Law Student Section be seated as a member of the Assembly.
- Approved a recommendation that the prevailing party in civil cases should under certain limited circumstances be entitled to reasonable fees at the discretion of the trial court, under guidelines and limitations provided by Rule.

- Recommended that the Michigan Supreme Court enter an Administrative Order recessing the courts of Michigan during the State Bar Annual Meeting.
- Opposed House Bill 4704 and supported House Bill 6034, two differing comprehensive revisions of the state's juvenile code.
- Approved the recommendation of the State Bar Committee on Continuing Legal Education that continuing legal education not be made mandatory for Michigan lawyers at this time; that the State Bar of Michigan renew its commitment to active and wide-ranging voluntary programs of continuing legal education; that the State Bar of Michigan continue to review specialization, certification and advertising and their effect upon the need for mandatory legal education.

APRIL 2, 1977

- Approved the report and recommendations of the Committee on Certification and Specialization proposing that the Code of Professional Responsibility be amended to provide for a system of self-designation in fields of practice for Michigan lawyers.
- Adopted a proposal that the State Bar of Michigan support a state or federal experimental program designed to determine if a heroin distribution program would reduce crime and/or reduce the use of heroin.
- Adopted a recommendation for federal legislation to make it unlawful for any person except police, licensed security guards, and target shooting clubs to import, manufacture, sell, buy, transfer, receive, or transport any handgun (except antiques) or handgun ammunition.

SEPTEMBER 15, 1977

- Adopted and recommended to the Michigan Supreme Court proposed amendments to the Code of Professional Responsibility establishing advertising guidelines to be used by Michigan lawyers.
- Defeated a proposed amendment to the Supreme Court Rules which would have allowed an elected officer of the Representative Assembly to continue to run for election as a member of the Assembly as long as he or she held an elected position.
- Adopted a motion amending Rule 5 of the Assembly Rules of Procedure allowing roll call votes to be taken any time a request for one is made and supported by at least 20 members of the Representative Assembly.

APRIL 1, 1978

- Adopted a proposal that the State Bar Committee on Economics of Law Practice be asked to investigate the utilization of computers and word processing equipment and word processing applications by the small law office and to process the books, record keeping, accounting, file storage and other administrative areas of the small law office.
- Adopted a recommendation of the Assembly Review Committee that the Permanent Rules of Procedure of the Representative Assembly be amended to provide that future officers of the Assembly be limited to a Chairperson and a Clerk.
- Adopted a substitute motion endorsing a Constitutional amendment providing for appointment of Supreme Court Justices and Judges of the Court of Appeals advocated by a coalition known as the Michigan Citizens to Take the Courts Out of Partisan Politics.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1978

- Adopted a proposal that the Supreme Court of Michigan be requested to adopt a rule providing that in every civil action except domestic relations cases, the prevailing party shall be awarded, in addition to other costs, a reasonable attorney fee if the trial court finds that the action was brought or was defended without foundation, vexatiously, frivolously, or in bad faith.
- Adopted a proposal that the Representative Assembly adopt basic goals for the State Bar of Michigan.
- Rejected a proposal that there be undertaken a confidential survey of judges and other informed sources as to the general competency of lawyers to determine if Chief Justice Warren Burger's assessment of lawyer competency has validity and that the Board of Commissioners be requested to finance such survey.

- Adopted a proposal that there be implemented a system for arbitrating fee disputes between attorneys and clients in the State Bar of Michigan resulting in binding awards if both parties consent, authorizing investigation of the claim and the furnishing of appropriate assistance to the client if the complaint about the fee is determined to be meritorious when only the client consents to arbitration and authorizing one public member 'to serve on three-member arbitration panels.

DECEMBER 9, 1978 (SPECIAL MEETING)

- Approved the nine recommendations of the Assembly Review Committee contained in its report and the Committee directed to take such action as necessary, including the preparation and submission of amendments to the Supreme Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan and the State Bar Bylaws, to implement the recommendations as soon as practicable and in no event later than the close of the 1979 Annual Meeting of the State Bar of Michigan.

MARCH 31, 1979

- Approved a recommendation of the Committee on Advertising, Certification and Specialization that the Assembly recommend to the Supreme Court that it terminate the trial period for the false, fraudulent, misleading and deceptive standard for advertising by lawyers, substitute therefore a rule substantially similar to the recommendation on advertising adopted by the Assembly in September 1977 for a one-year trial period, at the end of which the experiences under the two advertising approaches be reviewed and a permanent advertising rule.
- Approved a recommendation of the Special Committee on Court Fees that the State Bar of Michigan endorse state funding of judicial pension systems at an actuarial adequate level to finance presently authorized benefits and oppose the funding of judicial retirement systems through court fees.
- Approved a recommendation that the Assembly support the adoption by the Legislature of an amendment to the Paternity Act drafted by the Family Law Section which would allow married women in certain instances to obtain child support from the natural father.
- Approved a recommendation of the Special Committee on Public Interest Law that the State Bar involve itself in the delivery of public interest legal services and engage in related activities and emphasize to all members of the State Bar their obligation under Canon 2 of the Code of Professional Responsibility to "assist the legal professional in fulfilling its duty to make legal counsel available."
- Approved a recommendation of the Special Assembly Committee on Recognition of Local Bar Associations that State Bar recognition of such associations be governed by revised standards.

SEPTEMBER 20, 1979

- Rejected a proposal that the Representative Assembly endorse the concept of state funding of all judicial salaries.
- Rejected a proposal that the endorsement on behalf of the State Bar of Michigan by the Board of Commissioners of the proposed revised criminal code be withdrawn and that the draft be considered chapter by chapter.
- Rejected a proposal to amend the Permanent Rules of Procedure of the Representative Assembly to (1) authorize the Rules & Calendar Committee to withhold from the proposed Calendar, upon notice to the proponent and to the Assembly, matters which in its judgment do not raise issues pertaining to the policy of the State Bar of Michigan; and (2) provide a method by which members of the Assembly desiring to speak on a matter calendared for consideration can advise the Rules & Calendar Committee in advance so that the Committee can structure debate in order that proposed amendments are first considered, speakers in favor and in opposition are alternated, the Assembly is periodically and automatically asked to decide whether debate should be terminated, etc.
- Amended and approved a proposal that proposed MCR 2.403 - Mediation - under consideration by the Michigan Supreme Court be endorsed with the amendments set forth in the report of the State Bar Committee on Arbitration and Alternate Methods of Dispute Resolution.

JANUARY 12, 1980

- Deferred a proposal that the State Bar of Michigan design information programs for the mass media to inform the general public of the need for legal services and the availability of same in general during calendar year 1981 and that the Board of Commissioners be urged to appropriate the sums of \$50,000 for that purpose in 1981, and, commencing with the year

1982, an amount equal to \$15 per member per year for such programs.

- Rejected a proposal that the State Bar of Michigan endorse a rule mandating the use of letter-size paper in all Michigan Courts.
- Referred a proposal, to a special committee to be appointed by the Chairperson, that the State Bar of Michigan review its relations with the Institute of Continuing Legal Education.
- Deferred a recommendation that the State Bar of Michigan endorse the proposed new juvenile code (HB 4774), provided that the Legislature appropriate adequate funding for the services and facilities mandated thereunder.

MAY 3, 1980

- Adopted the recommendation of the Special Assembly Committee on Institute of Continuing Legal Education Liaison and Review that the Committee be dissolved, was upon motion made and seconded, amended 1) to request ICLE to submit a progress report to the Assembly at its September meeting with respect to its efforts to implement videotape courses through community colleges in order to broaden the availability of continuing legal education in more remote areas of the state; 2) to urge as a goal that continuing legal education courses be made available to every Michigan lawyer within one hour traveling time; and 3) to ask ICLE to study the feasibility of using State Bar headquarters in Lansing as a facility for the presentation of some of its courses.
- Adopted a proposal to recommend to the Supreme Court an amendment to GCR 821 which would require that all Court of Appeals decisions be published. Amended to recommend that the Rule be amended to permit any person to request that the panel of judges that filed the opinion order it to be published and that if such a request is made by any counsel of record the opinion be automatically published.
- Adopted a proposal to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court an amendment to GCR 912 which would provide that when the Court Administrator assigns a judge to decide a motion to disqualify a judge any party may request that the judge so appointed be from a district or circuit other than the district or circuit in which the challenged judge sits.
- Rejected a proposal to endorse the concept that parties in cases in multi-judge trial courts be permitted to exercise a peremptory challenge against the judge initially assigned.
- Adopted a proposal to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court an amendment to GCR 928 providing that the maximum allowable attorney fee for any claim or action for personal injury or wrongful death based upon the alleged conduct of another be 33-1/3% of the recovery.

SEPTEMBER 25, 1980

- Adopted a proposal that the State Bar endorse juvenile code revisions and that any such revisions be adequately funded in order to strengthen the juvenile justice system.
- Adopted a proposal that the State Bar endorse the concept of deductibility of legal expenses for federal and state income tax purposes.
- Adopted the report of the Committee on Communications of the State Bar of Michigan recommending that the Committee be authorized to continue to monitor developments concerning institutional advertising but that no such advertising campaign be embarked upon at this time.
- Adopted a proposal to petition the Michigan Supreme Court to amend the Supreme Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan to provide that the failure of any member of the Assembly to attend three consecutive meetings for any reason shall create a vacancy requiring the member be replaced.
- Adopted a proposal that the State Bar endorse the Administrative Adjudication Act proposed by the Hearing Officers and Administrative Law Judges Committee of the Administrative Law Section for submission and adoption by the Michigan Legislature, to exclude the Workers Compensation Bureau and the Employment Relations Commission from the act.
- Approved the report of the Committee on Professional and Judicial Ethics recommending the submission of comments with respect to the discussion draft of Model Rules of Professional Conduct circulated by the Commission on the Evaluation of Professional Standards of the American Bar Association.

JANUARY 17, 1981

- Adopted a proposal that the State Bar of Michigan recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court that the court rules be amended to require standardized pleadings on paper not to exceed 8-1/2" x 11" and that the change be phased-in over a period not to exceed three years.
- Adopted a proposal to affirm that it is the policy of the State Bar of Michigan not to sponsor activities in any club, association, business or other organization (except established religious corporations and associations) which discriminate in their membership policies on the basis of race, color, sex, national origin or religion.
- Adopted a proposal that the State Bar of Michigan reaffirm support for State funding of the judicial system; that the office of the Friend of the Court be specifically included in that affirmation; that the State Bar of Michigan support the Creation of an administrative office of the Friend of the Court within the State Court Administrator's office; and that the State Bar of Michigan support other changes consistent with State funding of the office of Friend of the Court fully outlined in the text of the proposal.
- Consideration of a substantially similar proposal urging that the rule be rescinded to allow the taking of depositions after trial in the Metropolitan Detroit District, including Detroit, Pontiac and Mt Clemens.
- Consideration of a proposal that the State Bar of Michigan endorse a new GCR 785.14 providing that no judge or person under the direct supervision of a judge shall appoint an attorney who is to represent an indigent defendant.
- Defeated a proposal that the State Bar of Michigan endorse a proposed change in GCR 960.1 which would provide that all disciplinary hearing panels consist of two attorneys and one public member.
- Adopted a proposal that the State Bar of Michigan communicate to the Chief Executive of the State of Michigan its opposition to the present application of Rule 10f.(a) of the administrative rules of the Bureau of Workers' Compensation, Department of Labor, under which all medical depositions in contested workers disability compensation proceedings are now required to be taken prior to the taking of lay testimony.
- Withdrew a resolution urging that Rule 10f.(a) of the administrative rules of the Bureau of Workers' Compensation, Department of Labor, be amended to allow the taking of depositions after trial in the Metropolitan Detroit district.
- Defeated a proposal that the State Bar of Michigan endorse a new GCR 785.14 providing that no judge or person under the direct supervision of a judge shall appoint an attorney who is to represent an indigent defendant.

MAY 9, 1981

- Adopted a proposal that the State Bar endorse a Constitutional Amendment providing for the appointment of Supreme Court Justices, Court of Appeals Judges, and the members of the State Board of Education and the governing boards of Michigan State University, the University of Michigan and Wayne State University; and that members of the State Bar of Michigan be urged to assist efforts to place this proposal on the ballot for the 1982 general election; and (2) to permit Lt. Governor James H. Brickley to speak in support thereof.
- Adopted a substitute motion to amend Rule 1.4 of the Assembly's Permanent Rules of Procedure to add a subsection (C) directing the Chairperson in consultation with the Clerk to circulate following each meeting of the Assembly with the notice of submission of calendar items for the next meeting a summary of the major policy actions taken by the Board of Commissioners between meetings of the Assembly.
- Adopted a proposal that the State Bar oppose any legislation which would increase the District Court's maximum civil jurisdiction beyond its existing \$10,000 level until such time as the State of Michigan is ready to provide funds and other resources necessary for implementation of a higher jurisdictional limit.
- Defeated a proposal to mandate non-smoking sections large enough to accommodate all non-smokers at all State Bar sponsored meetings.
- Adopted a proposal to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court that temporary appointment of judges be limited to those who do not leave office after a defeat in a general or special election.
- Defeated a proposal to recommend an amendment to the Supreme Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan

limiting the terms of members of the Board of Commissioners to two successive three-year terms.

- Adopted a proposal to instruct the State Bar Committee on Advertising, Certification and Specialization to continue to develop a certification plan for consideration by the Representative Assembly, such plan to include provisions addressing the effect, if any, of certification on the right of those who are and are not certified to advertise and to practice in that field.

SEPTEMBER 24, 1981

- Deferred consideration of a proposed Constitutional Amendment which would eliminate appeals as of right for those convicted of crimes upon pleas of guilty or nolo contendere and would permit such appeals by leave only.
- Adopted a proposal to direct the Standing Committee on Economics of Law Practice and/or General Practice Section to review and analyze existing legal fee financing plans, to make such inquiries as are deemed necessary to report to the Assembly on the structure and operations of such plans and to make a recommendation on the advisability of the adoption of such plans by the State Bar of Michigan.
- Adopted a proposal that the Representative Assembly recommend to the Legislature that MCLA 500.3009 (1) be amended by changing the minimum limits of motor vehicle liability insurance from \$20,000 per person and \$40,000 per accident to \$50,000 per person and \$100,000 per accident.
- Approved the amended report of the Committee on Professional and Judicial Ethics recommending the submission of comments with respect to the final draft of the Model Rules of Professional Conduct circulated by the American Bar Association Commission on the Evaluation of Professional Standards.
- Opposed legislation to raise the jurisdiction of the small claims court from \$600 to \$1,200 and to provide penalties for a defendant who removes a case from small claims court to district court if the plaintiff nevertheless recovers a judgment.

JANUARY 9, 1982

- Opposed a proposed Constitutional Amendment which would eliminate appeals as of right for those convicted of crimes upon pleas of guilty or nolo contendere and permit such appeals by leave only.
- Approved a proposal to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court adoption of an Administrative Order permitting certain proceedings to be conducted by communication equipment.
- Opposed Senate Bills 187 and 188 providing for the termination of marriages by summary dissolution were opposed in their present form.
- Defeated the proposed plan for certification in the field of (Family Law) drafted by the State Bar Standing Committee on Advertising, Certification and Specialization.

MAY 8, 1982

- Approved a proposal to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court an amendment to GCR 316.9 providing for expedited mediation of cases.
- Adopted a substitute motion directing that a system for adequate compensation for attorneys appointed to represent indigent defendants be drafted, giving consideration to the three factors for determining compensation incorporated in Assembly person Walsh's proposal which brought the issue before the Assembly, to be submitted to the Assembly for its consideration at its September meeting.
- Opposed HB 5285, which provides that prisoner appeals from disciplinary hearings may be made only when leave is granted by the Circuit Court.
- Opposed the concept of summary dissolution of marriage.

SEPTEMBER 23, 1982

- Adopted a proposal to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court that Standard Civil Jury Instructions 53.03 be made discretionary.

- Defeated a recommendation to the Michigan Supreme Court the adoption of a new General Court Rule providing for the appointment of Masters.
- Adopted a recommendation that the principles and objectives of HB 4838 regulating credit insurance be endorsed.
- Adopted a recommendation to the Supreme Court that it establish the minimally adequate level of compensation for attorneys appointed to represent indigent defendants.
- Opposed a proposed amendment to the Michigan Constitution eliminating the prohibition against the death penalty.

JANUARY 15, 1983

- Approved a recommendation to petition the Michigan Supreme Court for an amendment to the Code of Professional Responsibility requiring lawyers to create and maintain one or more interest bearing trust accounts for client funds other than advances for costs and expenses which are nominal in amount or, at the time of receipt and deposit are expected to be held for a short period of time, the income from which is to be used to finance legal services to the indigent.

MAY 14, 1983

- Approved the recommendations of the State Bar Committee on Scope and Correlation for the adoption of basic goals for the State Bar of Michigan.
- Approved the recommendation of the General Practice Section to refer the establishment of a Legal Fee Financing Plan in Michigan to a committee designated by the Board of Commissioners.
- Approved a proposal that the State Bar of Michigan actively pursue and encourage legislation amending the Michigan Tax Tribunal Act to require that all persons conducting hearings be attorneys admitted to practice in this State.
- Denied a request from the University of Michigan Law School that the State Bar support an amendment to CCR 921 which would extend authorization for student practice to qualified students involved in law school clinical practice programs on behalf of nonprofit organizations.
- Approved a proposal to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court that amendments to the Code of Judicial Conduct be adopted which would permit television cameras in the appellate courts and would authorize a one-year experiment in broadcasting, televising, recording and taking photographs of trial court proceedings upon "leave granted by the Michigan Supreme Court to the trial judge with protective guidelines."

SEPTEMBER 29, 1983

- Approved a proposal to endorse the establishment of a Dispute Resolution Center in Washtenaw County and to recommend to the Board of Commissioners that State Bar funds be appropriated to partly fund its first year of operation.
- Considered proposals to amend GCR 932 and to adopt a new GCR 931 dealing with the Judicial Tenure Commission were referred to the Assembly Committee on Hearings for evaluation and report to be circulated in writing to the Assembly no later than six weeks before the January 7, 1984 meeting.

JANUARY 7, 1984

- Approved the recommendations of the Assembly Committee on Hearings concerning proposed amendments to the rules governing the judicial tenure process.
- Adopted the recommendations of the State Bar Committee on Professional and Judicial Ethics to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court the adoption of Model Rules of Professional Conduct to replace the Code of Professional Responsibility.

MAY 5, 1984

- Approved a recommendation that the State Bar of Michigan endorse improved appellate rights for veterans and recommend to Michigan members of Congress that legislation be introduced to 1) provide access to the courts for appeals from adverse decisions of the Veterans Administration; and 2) provide for payment of legal fees sufficient to insure adequate representation of veterans by counsel.

- Endorsed an amendment to the Michigan Constitution which would replace the present partisan party convention process for nominating candidates for Supreme Court justice by a non-partisan primary election.

SEPTEMBER 20, 1984

- Adopted a proposal to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court that the Supreme Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan be amended to reduce the number of mandatory meetings of the Assembly from three to two a year.
- Endorsed Senate Bill 816 which raises the jurisdictional limit of the Small Claims court to \$1,000 effective January 1, 1985 and to \$1,500 effective September 1, 1986, raises certain fees in district court and eliminates others, authorizes small claims hearings before attorney magistrates, and makes other changes in the law pertaining to the small claims courts.
- Adopted the recommendations of the State Bar Special Committee on Victims of Crimes.

JANUARY 19, 1985

- Approved the report of the Special Assembly Review Committee recommending that the Michigan Supreme Court be petitioned to adopt amendments in the Supreme Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan and that the Board of Commissioners be requested to adopt related amendments in the State Bar Bylaws.
- Considered a request for State Bar support for legislation which prohibits the exercise of peremptory challenges of jurors on the basis of group bias and establishes procedures for determining whether such challenges have been improperly exercised was tabled until a revised proposal is submitted and reviewed by appropriate State Bar Committees and Sections.

MAY 11, 1985

- Endorsed legislation converting part-time, part-paid probate judges in Michigan to full-time judges funded by the State of Michigan.
- Defeated a motion to endorse HJR D and SJR B, which would place on the November 1986 general election ballot a proposed amendment to the Michigan Constitution eliminating the prohibition against the death penalty.
- Adopted a motion to oppose HJR D and SJR B, which would place on the November 1986 general election ballot a proposed amendment to the Michigan Constitution eliminating the prohibition against the death penalty.
- Defeated a proposal to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court that MCR 2.625 be amended to provide that in any civil action in which a final disposition is rendered the prevailing party shall be entitled to reimbursement for its actual attorney fees reasonably incurred, in addition to the relief awarded and the costs otherwise provided by the Rule.
- Adopted a proposal that the State Bar of Michigan oppose the Uniform Marital Property Act.

SEPTEMBER 12, 1985

- Adopted a proposal to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court a procedure for the nomination and appointment of at-large members of the Board of Commissioners and Representative Assembly.
- Adopted the recommendation of the Special Assembly Review Committee to create a committee charged with the responsibility of bringing to the Assembly for consideration important policy issues not otherwise submitted, to establish the Special Assembly Review Committee as a Standing Committee charged with the responsibility of periodically reviewing the operation of the Assembly and urging the Assembly to give more meaningful consideration to legislative matters.
- Adopted a proposal to petition the Michigan Supreme Court for an amendment of the Supreme Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan to increase the number of elected members of the Board of Commissioners from 19 to 20.
- Adopted a recommendation that the Court of Appeals be urged to continue to formulate new procedures designed to give counsel at oral argument as much information as possible pertaining to the concerns of the panel with respect to issues on appeal.
- Adopted a proposed rule to be submitted to the Michigan Supreme Court providing that whenever a court acting in an appellate capacity decides to consider any question of law or fact not raised by a participant in the proceeding, the court

shall so notify the parties and provide them with an opportunity to file supplemental pleadings addressed to that issue.

- Adopted the Assembly Rules of procedure were suspended by the necessary 2/3 vote to permit consideration of a motion to spread upon the records of the Assembly a letter written by President Archer to the Detroit Free Press which was printed as a column in the August 22 issue of that newspaper, to commend President Archer for that letter and to request that the letter be published in the Michigan Bar Journal.

JANUARY 11, 1986

- Adopted a proposal to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court the adoption of case flow management standards was amended to urge the adoption of case flow management goals.
- Deferred to the May meeting a proposal to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court the adoption of an amendment to MCR 7.215(f) concerning the precedential effect of Court of Appeal decisions while an application for leave to appeal to the Michigan Supreme Court is pending.
- Adopted a proposal to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court amendments to Michigan Court Rules pertaining to disciplinary enforcement.

SEPTEMBER 18, 1986

- Adopted a proposal to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court the adoption of an amendment to MCR 7.215(C) concerning the precedential effect of Court of Appeals decisions while review by the Michigan Supreme Court is pending.
- Defeated a proposed plan for Certification in the Field of (Family Law).
- Deferred to the April meeting consideration of a proposal to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court the adoption of a Michigan Court Rule authorizing summary jury trials.

APRIL 4, 1987

- Approved a proposal to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court the adoption of a proposal for mandatory continuing legal education.
- Approved a proposal to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court the adoption of a Michigan Court Rule authorizing summary jury trials.
- Adopted the legislative priorities for the current legislative session.

SEPTEMBER 17, 1987

- Opposed proposed legislation which would require that the prosecutor consent to and the trial judge approve a defendant's waiver of a trial by jury in criminal cases (HB 4534 and SB 273).
- Approved proposed legislation which would exempt qualified annuity, pension, profit-sharing or other retirement plans from garnishment, attachment, execution and bankruptcy (HB 4666), with recommended amendments to extend the exemption to Individual Retirement Accounts which are non-deductible and deny the exemption to amounts contributed within 120 days before a debtor files for bankruptcy.
- Endorsed for recommendation to the Michigan Supreme Court proposed Standards for Assigned Counsel.
- Approved proposed legislation which would permit a person to designate another to make medical treatment decisions on that person's behalf or to execute a declaration directing that life-sustaining procedures be withdrawn or withheld in the event the person is suffering a terminal condition from which death is eminent (HB 4176 and HB 4647) subject to reservations expressed in the report of the Committee on Medicolegal Problems in its report of September 11, 1987.
- Other proposed legislation concerning related subject matter (SB 2324) was not supported by a vote exceeding two-thirds of those present.
- Opposed proposed legislation which would provide that the determination whether an injured person has sustained a

serious impairment of body function for purposes of recovering damages for non-economic loss under the automobile no-fault law is a question of law for the court and further providing that a person shall not have suffered a serious impairment of body function unless the person has suffered an objectively manifested impairment of an important body function which affects his or her general ability to lead a normal life (SB 352).

APRIL 23, 1988

- Amended Rule 1.1 of the Assembly's Permanent Rules of Procedure to prohibit smoking at all Assembly meetings.
- Amended Rule 4.6 of the Assembly's Permanent Rules of Procedure to require that all resolutions be in writing and that any proposed amendment to a resolution on the Assembly's calendar which is more than six words in length be in writing and submitted to the Clerk at or before the time it is seconded.
- Adopted a proposal to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court that MRPC 7.2(c) be amended to require that not-for-profit lawyer referral services and other legal service organizations in which lawyers participate file with the Court a written plan of operation, update their filings within thirty days of any change and in January of each year thereafter file a statement representing that they continue to do business under the terms and conditions reflected in their prior filings.
- Endorsed HB 5174 which would increase the jurisdiction of the small claims court to \$2,500; eliminate the existing prohibition against actions for fraud being instituted in the small claims court; require the district judge or magistrate to orally inform the parties of their right to remove the action to the general civil division of the court and of the rights waived if they choose not to do so; and make provision for examining a defendant against whom a money judgment has been awarded, amended to wherever appropriate substitute the term "judgment debtor" for the term "defendant" and make provision to authorize the examination of the judgment debtor by the filing under oath of a form provided for that purpose as well as by the judge.
- Opposed HB 4788 through HB 4814, which would establish a family court.

SEPTEMBER 29, 1988

- Amended the proposal of a State Bar policy with respect to facilities at which State Bar meetings may not be held to also prohibit meetings in facilities which do not provide barrier free access to the handicapped.
- Adopted a proposal to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court the adoption of an amendment to MRPC 1.8 (e) (1) to permit a lawyer to advance court costs and expenses of litigation repayment of which is contingent solely upon the outcome of the matter.
- Adopted a proposal to amend Rules 2.2 and 2.3 of the Assembly Rules of Procedure to provide a uniform deadline for placing matters on its calendar.

APRIL 22, 1989

- Adopted a proposal to petition the Michigan Supreme Court to amend the Supreme Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan to create a category of affiliate membership in the State Bar of Michigan for law office administrators and legal assistants, and to recommend that the Board of Commissioners adopt conforming amendments to the State Bar Bylaws.
- Adopted the following legislative priorities for the current legislative session:
 1. Require that candidates for judicial office must have been licensed to practice law for at least five years, and candidates for the position of hearing officer within the executive branch must have been licensed to practice law at least three years, before they are eligible for appointment or election to office. (Unanimous).
 2. Provide for statewide funding of the administration of justice.
 3. Adopt express statutory provisions that durable powers of attorney may vest decision-making authority concerning medical treatment decisions, and establish a statutory hierarchy of persons authorized to make medical decisions when an adult is incapacitated and has not designated anyone to do so.
 4. Enact the proposed "Michigan Domestic Relations Code" drafted by the Family Law Section codifying present Michigan law with changes:
 - Permitting marriage by proxy in some circumstances.
 - Providing that "antenuptial" agreements may be effective upon divorce.
 - Rewriting jurisdiction and venue provisions.
 - Allowing independent and post-judgment actions for custody, visitation and parenting time, child support, domestic

- violence orders, and conservation of marital property.
 - Eliminating the presumption that joint custody is always appropriate.
 - Restricting the freedom of a person with custody from moving more than 100 miles without consent from noncustodial parties or the court.
 - Specifying circumstances under which a court can order child support beyond the 18th birthday.
- 5. Establishing a “main rule” that each party receive his/her own individual property plus one-half of the marital property.
- 6. Allowing the parties to agree to nonmodifiable alimony.
- 7. Defining and providing for orders concerning “expenses of litigation.”
- 8. Enact substantive revisions to update and clarify the Michigan Business Corporation Act. The proposed changes:
 - Revise the corporate finance provisions based on the Revised Model Business Corporation Act, including:
 - a unified distribution concept for determining dividend and repurchase validity under insolvency tests;
 - elimination of references to par value, stated capital and surplus; and
 - clarification of installment share repurchases.
 - Clarify interested director transaction standards.
- 9. Introduce the concept of the “independent director” with special authority as an attempt to improve corporate governance.
- 10. Revise appraisal rights, clarify relief for oppression of minority shareholders and specify derivative litigation procedures.
- 11. Revise dissolution provisions to deal with post dissolution claims.
- 12. Standardize treatment of various forms of corporate acquisitions.
- 13. Generally, resolve interpretative issues that have been raised by courts and commentators, and make numerous technical improvements.
- 14. Support income and asset ceilings at \$1,500 per month of joint income and \$60,000 of joint assets (the maximum amounts permitted under federal law) for Medicaid eligibility to avoid “spousal impoverishment” when one partner requires continuing nursing home care.
- Adopted a proposal to petition the Michigan Supreme Court to amend the Supreme Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan to increase State Bar dues from \$150 to \$200 for members admitted three years or more and from \$90 to \$120 for members admitted less than three years.
- Adopted a proposal to petition the Michigan Supreme Court to amend MRPC 7.2 and MRPC 7.3 to remove the blanket prohibition against targeted mail solicitation in order to conform to a decision of the United States Supreme Court declaring such prohibition unconstitutional, and to authorize participation in prepaid legal services plans which directly solicit membership so long as those marketing efforts are not directed at persons known to need legal services in a particular matter covered by the plan.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1989

- Adopted an amended proposal to request the Supreme Court of Michigan to amend the MRPC 1.9 and MRPC 1.10 and related comment.
- Adopted in principle a proposal to endorse legislation amending the Michigan Professional Services Corporation Act to eliminate the requirement that shareholders of professional corporations be licensed to practice in Michigan, thereby permitting Michigan professional corporations to have shareholders who are licensed in other states.
- Defeated a proposal to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court amendments to MCR 9.119(G) providing for compensation by the State Bar of Michigan to persons appointed to inventory the files.
- Defeated a proposal to authorize the appointment of a joint committee of Commissioners and Assembly persons to study the proposal that MCR 9.119(G) be amended to provide for compensation by the State Bar of Michigan to persons appointed to inventory files.

APRIL 28, 1990

- Adopted a proposal that the use of the phrase “Now Comes” be discouraged.
- Adopted a proposal that the State Bar of Michigan recommend that the American Bar Association adopt the ABA Model Rules of Judicial Conduct, with certain amendments proposed by the State Bar of Michigan Standing Committee on Professional and Judicial Ethics.

- Adopted an amendment to delete the phrase “. . . or will be engaged frequently in adversary proceeding in any court.” from Canon 4C(a) of the Model Code.
- Adopted the amended proposal to adopt a voluntary standard for *pro bono* participation by all State Bar of Michigan members to broaden the options available for compliance with the standards as well as the class of recipients needing *pro bono* services.
- The amendment added the following language as new item 3: “Providing a minimum of 30 hours of professional services at no fee or a reduced fee to persons of limited means, or to public service or charitable groups or organizations,” and renumbered former item 3 as item 4.

SEPTEMBER 13, 1990

- Adopted a proposal to petition the Supreme Court to amend the Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct to add a rule permitting and governing the sale of a law practice.
- Approved a proposal to petition the Michigan Supreme Court to amend MRPC 3.8 concerning the special responsibilities of a prosecutor to require that specific procedures be followed, and court approval be obtained before a prosecutor can subpoena a lawyer in a grand jury or other criminal proceeding to present evidence about a past or present client.
- Adopted a proposal to petition the Michigan Supreme Court to amend Rule 5, Section 2 (3), of the Supreme Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan to provide that the Young Lawyers Section representatives on the Board of Commissioners are the Chairperson-Elect and the Chairperson rather than the Chairperson and immediate past Chairperson.
- Adopted a proposal to petition the Michigan Supreme Court to amend Rules 5 and 6 of the Supreme Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan to authorize the creation of an additional Representative Assembly officer position and to provide that the person filling that office be added to the membership of the Board of Commissioners.
- Adopted a proposal to petition the Michigan Supreme Court to extend Administrative Order 1989-2 permitting the creation of the record of court proceedings by videotape and authorizing any trial court in the state to apply to the State Court Administrative Office for permission to do so.
- Adopted the amended proposal to petition the Michigan Supreme Court to amend the Michigan Code of Judicial Conduct, MCR 9.205 and the Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct to incorporate provisions prohibiting invidious discrimination by judges and lawyers by deleting references to attending functions sponsored by or at premises owned or operated by organizations that invidiously discriminate.
- Defeated a proposal to endorse the bifurcation of the investigative and prosecutorial functions in judicial discipline currently vested in the Judicial Tenure Commission.

APRIL 20, 1991

- Approved the legislative priorities for the current legislative session recommended by the Ad Hoc Legislative Review Committee.
- Adopted an amended proposal to recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court the amendment of MRPC 8.3 to provide that the requirement that a lawyer having knowledge that another lawyer has committed a significant violation of the Rules of Professional Conduct that raises a substantial question as to that lawyer’s honesty, trustworthiness or fitness as a lawyer shall inform the Attorney Grievance Commission does not require disclosure of information gained by a lawyer or judge while serving as a member of the State Bar lawyers and judges counseling program to the extent the information would be protected as a confidence if it were to constitute a communication between lawyer and client under Rule 1.6.
- Adopted a recommendation that the Michigan Supreme Court be requested to amend the Supreme Court Rules concerning the State Bar of Michigan to increase the number of its at-large appointees to the Board of Commissioners from three to five to permit additional representation of women and minorities who are unlikely to be elected to the Board.
- Adopted the recommendation of the Keller Task Force that the deduction/diversion dues collection option offered to members in 1990-91 be continued for at least one additional year with the understanding that a major effort will be undertaken for

the 1991 dues season to persuade members to support the entire range of State Bar activities by paying full dues.

- Adopted a proposal that the Michigan Supreme Court be requested to adopt the Proposed Michigan Code of Judicial Conduct (1991) to replace the Michigan Code of Judicial Conduct (1974).

SEPTEMBER 26, 1991

- Adopted the proposed amendments to the Assembly Rules of Procedure to incorporate the newly established position of vice-chairperson and to make all language gender neutral.
- Defeated a proposal to amend the Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct to require lawyers to maintain trust accounts in financial institutions which agree to notify the Attorney Grievance Commission whenever a check drawn against insufficient funds is presented.
- Defeated a proposal to amend the Michigan Court Rules to provide for automatic suspension of a lawyer who does not timely respond to a Request for an Investigation.

APRIL 4, 1992

- Defeated Senate Bill 460, which would increase the jurisdiction of the District Court in civil actions from \$10,000 to \$25,000 referred to the Assembly for its consideration by the Board of Commissioners.
- Adopted a proposal to request the Board of Commissioners to amend the State Bar Bylaws to establish a procedure for nominating candidates to fill vacancies in the Representative Assembly in multi-member circuits.
- Approved the amendment to a proposed Michigan Court Rule governing the administration of the mediation process in civil cases.

SEPTEMBER 17, 1992

- Defeated Senate Bill 688 and 689, which would permit the taking of a laboratory technician's testimony in a preliminary examination by voice communication equipment rather than in person.
- Adopted to support a proposal to amend Rule 6.1 of the ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct to provide that a lawyer should render at least 50 hours of *pro bono publico* legal services each year, at least 40 hours of which should consist of the provision of legal services without fee or expectation of fee to persons of limited means or charitable, religious, civic, community, governmental and educational organizations in matters which are designed primarily to address the needs of persons of limited means.
- Adopted to support House Bill 5453 which authorizes the execution of a do-not-resuscitate declaration and related procedures.
- Defeated House Bill 5492 which authorizes a statutory durable power of attorney.
- Thereafter, a motion to reconsider was adopted and upon reconsideration a motion to request the Probate and estate Planning Section of the State Bar of Michigan to draft legislation establishing a statutory durable power of attorney for future consideration by the Representative Assembly was adopted.
- Adopted a motion that the State Bar of Michigan urge all Michigan law schools to increase the number of minorities serving as full time faculty.
- Defeated House Bills 5436 and 5644 which declare void settlement agreements by state and local units of government that prohibit disclosure of their terms and prohibit the concealing of a public hazard in certain judgments, contracts and agreements.

APRIL 24, 1993

- Tabled the consideration of a proposal to endorse a Standard Retainer Agreement Form.
- Adopted a proposal to amend the Assembly Rules of Procedure to provide additional standing committees and to establish a process for nominating candidates for the position of Clerk of the Representative Assembly.

- Adopted the following State Bar legislative priorities for the 1993-94 session of the Legislature:
 1. Implement statewide funding of the administration of justice.
 2. Provide state funding of all indigent trial and appellate counsel costs and continued state funding of the prosecuting attorneys appellate service.
 3. Amend arbitration statute to authorize arbitration of domestic relations disputes.
 4. Support community-based alternatives to incarceration.
 5. Reform Michigan's inheritance tax law by substituting a "pickup tax".
 6. Enact legislation permitting decriminalization of municipal ordinance violations, permitting them to be treated as civil infractions.
 7. Increase the number of Court of Appeals judges.
- Defeated a proposal to authorize a statutory durable power of attorney.
- Adopted a proposal to petition the Supreme Court to bifurcate the State Bar dues into one portion to fund the lawyer discipline system, the amount of which to be set by the Michigan Supreme Court annually, and the other portion to fund all other State Bar activities, the amount of which to be set periodically by the Michigan Supreme Court upon petition by the Representative Assembly.
- Approved a proposal to petition the Michigan Supreme Court to increase the State Bar portion of dues, assuming the proposal to bifurcate is approved, to \$175 effective October 1, 1993.
- Tabled a proposal to petition the Michigan Supreme Court to enter an Administrative Order limiting ideological advocacy by the State Bar of Michigan to issues involving (1) questions concerning the regulation and discipline of attorneys; (2) matters relating to the improvement of the function of the courts, judicial ethics and efficiency; (3) increasing the availability of legal services to society; (4) regulation of attorney's client trust account; and (5) the education, ethics, competence, integrity and regulation as a body of the legal profession.

JUNE 19, 1993 (SPECIAL MEETING)

- Adopted a proposal to petition the Michigan Supreme Court to enter an Administrative Order limiting ideological advocacy by the State Bar of Michigan to issues involving (1) questions concerning the regulation and discipline of attorneys; (2) matters relating to the improvement of the function of the courts, judicial ethics and efficiency; (3) increasing the availability of legal services to society; (4) regulation of attorney's client trust account; and (5) the education, ethics, competence, integrity and regulation as a body of the legal profession.

SEPTEMBER 30, 1993

- Approved the recommendations of the Task Force on Appellate Courts.
- Adopted a proposal to adopt Voluntary Standards for Lawyers Concerning Domestic Violence.

APRIL 23, 1994

- Adopted a proposal to amend MCR 2.405 which would expand the definition of "verdict" to include a disposition by motion and eliminate the difference in application of the mediation and offer of judgment rules post-mediation.
- Adopted a proposal to adopt a Model Law Firm Employment Policy Prohibiting Sexual Harassment.
- Opposed proposals to amend Canon 7(b)(2)(C) of the Michigan Code of Judicial Conduct to change the amount and limit the sources of judicial campaign contributions.
- Approved the proposed Court Rule establishing and governing law practice receiverships when a lawyer disappears, dies, is disabled, or has been suspended or disbarred, and there is no one readily available to handle client matters.
- Referred a proposal for the adoption of a certification program or state accreditation program for specialties in the law for the State of Michigan to the Assembly Hearing Committee to be reconsidered by the Representative Assembly at its September 22, 1994 meeting.
- Withdrew a proposal to authorize a state sponsored certification program of specialists in family law for the State of Michigan.

SEPTEMBER 22, 1994

- Adopted a proposal to mandate the use of recycled paper in all court filings.
- Referred a proposal to endorse a Standard Retainer Agreement Form to all State Bar Committees for comment.
- Adopted a proposal for the President of the State Bar to appoint a committee to address issues of lawyer advertising and lawyer specialty certification, including any existing or alternative enforcement mechanisms, as well as the relationship, if any, between concerns about lawyer competency and mandatory continuing legal education.

JANUARY 14, 1995

- Defeated a motion to enforce the concepts of the 21st Century Courts committee Report as State Bar Policy regarding comprehensive reform of Michigan's justice system.
- Authorized that the State Bar of Michigan in consultation with the judges' associations and the Michigan Supreme Court, through its designees, to appear before the Legislature and represent the interests of the Bar in the improvement of the judicial system.

APRIL 22, 1995

- Approved the proposed amendment to the Supreme Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan to establish a plan of legal certification.
- The Committee on Delivery of Legal Services, withdrew its proposal on Michigan Lawyer Referral Standards and the ABA proposed Model Supreme Court Rules Governing Lawyer Referral and Information Services to enable the Committee to further refine the proposal before resubmitting it for Assembly consideration.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1995

- Defeated a motion to endorse a Standard Retainer Agreement form.
- Referred a proposal to amend MRPC 6.3 on Lawyer Referral Services to the Ethics Committee.
- Referred a proposal to establish standards for the administrative appointment of indigent defense counsel from lists of qualified attorneys based upon objective criteria to the Committee on Hearings.

APRIL 27, 1996

- Adopted a proposal to amend MRPC 6.3(b) to regulate lawyer referral services.
- Referred a proposal to amend MCR 9.109(B)(5) providing for confidentiality of disciplinary investigative information to the Assembly Hearings Committee.
- Defeated a proposal to amend MCR 9.125 to limit immunity of participants in the discipline process.
- Referred a proposal to create an Assembly Committee on the Profession to the Assembly Review Committee.
- Adopted the proposed ten Basic Goals for the State Bar of Michigan as presented by the Long-Range Planning Committee the following:
 1. The efficiency of the justice system
 2. Laws, rules and jurisprudence
 3. The independence of the bench and bar
 4. The professionalism and competence of the bench and bar
 5. Access to justice for all
 6. The public service of the bench and bar
 7. Public understanding of and respect for the justice system and profession
 8. The openness of the profession
 9. Member interests and a high-quality professional practice and life
 10. The position of the State Bar of Michigan as the representative of the profession

SEPTEMBER 19, 1996

- Approved the recommendation of the Assembly Review Committee to refer to the State Bar Long-Range Planning Committee and to State Bar committees and sections having subject matter jurisdiction the following:
- Appointment of a Special Hearing Committee based on referrals from the Assembly; Appointment of a Committee on the Profession to consist of ten Representatives to study and present issues that the assembly might want to consider in the future; Appointment of a special committee to review disciplinary rules; Appointment of outreach liaisons to the sections of the State Bar; Development of local meetings for circuits and combinations of circuits of the Representative Assembly.
- Expansion of responsibility of the Drafting Committee to include preparation of a summary for each proposal presented to the Assembly and preparation of a brief for each proposal recommended to the Supreme Court by the Assembly. Also, expansion of the membership of the Drafting Committee to seven, each from a different circuit.
- Approved the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Judicial Selection to ask the Legislature to appoint, by joint resolution, a bipartisan citizens' commission that represents a cross-section of individuals to ensure race, ethnic and gender diversity, to examine Michigan's system of judicial selection, and to report its recommendations and conclusions within twelve months of appointment.
- Referred back to the Standing Committee on Professional and Judicial Ethics a proposal to amend MRPC 4.2.
- Approved the recommendation of the Senior Justice Section to ask the Michigan Supreme Court to create a statewide task force to study the current operations of the state's guardianship and conservatorship systems and make necessary recommendations for improvements.
- A recommendation of the Standing Committee on Professionalism to amend MRPC 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3 was withdrawn by the proponents prior to the session.
- Approved the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Grievance to ask the Michigan Supreme Court to amend MCR 9.115(F)(4) regarding reciprocal disclosure of witness statements in lawyer discipline proceedings.

APRIL 26, 1997

- Denied adoption of the proposal to amend MRPC 4.2 and related comment regarding communication with a person represented by counsel.
- Denied adoption of the proposed Standards for Assigned Counsel.
- Approved the amendments to MCR 2.305, 2.310 and 2.506 on Non-party Record Subpoenas; and MCR 2.302(F) on Stipulations Regarding Discovery Procedure.
- Approved changes to proposed amendments to MRPC 6.3.

SEPTEMBER 18, 1997

- Approved the recommendation of the Committee on Civil Procedure to ask the Michigan Supreme Court to amend MCR 3.101 regarding Garnishment after Judgment.
- Approved the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Civil Procedure to ask the Michigan Supreme Court to amend MCR 2.317 regarding Discovery Masters.
- Approved the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Civil Procedure to ask the Michigan Supreme Court to amend MCR 2.402(B) regarding attendance at pretrial.
- Adopted the Model Family Medical Leave Policy recommended by the Labor and Employment Section.
- Approved the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Civil Procedure to ask the Michigan Supreme Court to amend MCR 2.625(G) regarding taxation of costs.
- Approved the recommendation of the Attorney Grievance Commission to ask the Michigan Supreme Court to amend MRPC 1.8 regarding prohibiting sex with clients.

- Approved the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Professional Ethics and the Committee on Delivery of Legal Services to ask the Michigan Supreme Court to amend Rule 6.3 regarding legal services organizations and lawyer referral services.
- Defeated a proposal by the Assigned Counsel Standards Committee to establish guidelines for training assigned criminal counsel.

APRIL 25, 1998

- Approved the proposal to amend Rules 3 and 15 of the Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan regarding the licensing of lawyers.
- Approved the proposal, with modification, to amend MCR 7.305(B)(1) regarding state and tribal courts.
- Defeated the proposal to amend MCR 2.107(C) concerning facsimile service.
- Approved the proposal to amend MCR 2.203(A)(2) regarding compulsory joinder of claims.
- Approved the proposal, as amended, to amend MCJC 7 (Canon 7: A judge or a Candidate for Judicial Office Should Refrain from Political Activity Inappropriate to Judicial Office).

SEPTEMBER 17, 1998

- Defeated the proposal to amend MCR 2.203 to make certain counterclaims compulsory, submitted by the Standing Committee on Civil Procedure.
- Approved, as amended, a proposal to amend Rule 15, Section 3 (1) of the Supreme Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan, which would add the Plain English Lawyer's Oath as an optional version for admission ceremonies for new lawyers.

APRIL 24, 1999

- Approved with modification, the proposed amendment to MCR 2.107 concerning facsimile service.
- Approved the proposed amendment to MCR 2.310 concerning response time to document requests.
- Tabled the proposal to amend MRE 803A and MCR 5.972 regarding child protection proceedings.

SEPTEMBER 16, 1999

- Referred the pilot project reports to the Assembly Review Committee.
- Approved proposed MCR 1.110, allowing legal assistant's fees to be awarded by the Court.
- Approved a proposed resolution on unauthorized practice of law.
- Tabled the proposed amendment of Canon 7 and adoption of New Canon 8 of the Michigan Code of Judicial Conduct concerning Judicial Campaigns.
- Approved the recommendation to ask the Michigan Supreme Court to consider extending the comment period for proposed Court Rule amendments published in the Bar Journal to a 90-day period instead of the current 60-days.
- Defeated a proposed amendment to Supreme Court Rule 6, Section 2 to allow one seat in the Assembly for each section of the State Bar.
- Referred the proposed amendment to Supreme Court Rule 7, Section 1 to provide for the automatic succession of the office of Vice-President to President-Elect to the Assembly Drafting Committee.

NOVEMBER 11, 1999

- Recommended that the Court's proposal to amend MCJC 7(A)(2)(a) be rejected. This proposal would allow a judge or judicial candidate to attend political fund-raising events that honor the judiciary generally, not the individual judge by name, provided that the judge does not personally solicit funds for, or attendance at, such events.
- Unanimously recommended that the Court's proposal to add MCJC 7(A)(4) be rejected. This proposal would make it unethical for an organization consisting exclusively of judges to make a false, fraudulent, misleading, or deceptive statement about judicial candidates. It would also require these associations to identify the members of their organization in any public communication.
- Recommended that the Court's proposal to add MCJC 7(B)(2)(a) be rejected. This proposal would specifically allow a judge to send a thank you note or other acknowledgment to a contributor.
- Recommended that the Court's proposal to amend MCJC 7(B)(2)(c) be rejected. The Assembly unanimously recommended that the maximum solicitation of a lawyer by a judicial candidate remain at \$100. This proposal would raise the maximum solicitation of a lawyer by a judicial candidate from \$100 to \$300. It would also allow a general solicitation in excess of \$300, with an appropriate disclaimer.
- Recommended that the Court's proposal to amend MCJC 7(B)(2)(c) be amended to begin the solicitation period on February 1 instead of January 1 and then be adopted. As originally presented, this proposal would change the starting date for fund solicitation from 180 days before a primary election or nominating convention to January 1 of the year of the election.
- Unanimously recommended that the Court's proposal to amend MCJC 7(B)(2)(c) be rejected. This proposal would allow the solicitation of funds for 45 days after the date of the general election.
- Unanimously recommended that the Court's proposal MCJC (7)(2) be adopted. This proposal would eliminate a paragraph that applied only to the 1974 campaign year.
- Unanimously recommended that the Court's proposal to add Canon 8 be rejected. This proposal would also apply to judges' associations or any other organization consisting exclusively of judges.
- Tabled a motion that had been made and seconded, without vote of the Assembly, in support of full public financing of judicial campaigns in Michigan.

JANUARY 22, 2000

- Unanimously adopted the proposed amendments to Supreme Court Rule 7, Section 1 to provide for the automatic succession of the office of the Vice-President to President-Elect.
- Approved the proposed modification to MCR 9.112(B)(3) regarding requests for investigation.
- Approved recommendation that a subjective test be used to determine "actual malice" under Michigan Rule of Professional Conduct 8.2(a).

APRIL 29, 2000

- Approved to recommend that the Michigan Supreme Court adopt the proposed amendments to the mediation and ADR court rules, with four additional amendments offered by the Assembly.
- Supported the proposed amendments to Rule 7.7 of its Permanent Rules of Procedures as to the role of the existing "Special Issues Committee."
- Rejected the proposed resolution to acknowledge the widespread perception of a decline of civility among lawyers and to ask the State Bar to pursue appropriate measures to address this issue.
- Supported the proposed resolution to encourage the State Bar to study the implementation of civility guidelines for all lawyers in Michigan.

- Supported the proposed resolution for the State Bar to develop and promote mentoring programs for lawyers.
- Supported the proposed resolution for the State Bar to develop and promote programs on ethics education for lawyers.
- Unanimously rejected the proposed amendment of Canon 7 of the Michigan Code of Judicial Conduct concerning Judicial Campaigns.
- Supported the proposed amendment of the Character and Fitness fee increase.

SEPTEMBER 21, 2000

- Adopted as amended to unanimously recommend to the Michigan Supreme Court that this amendment to MCR 6.435 be adopted.
- Unanimously opposed the adoption of proposed amendments of subchapters MCR 7.300 and MCR 9.100 regarding permanent disbarment Court Rules.
- Refer the issue of the use of part-time Judicial or Quasi-Judicial Officers to committees and sections for further study.

FEBRUARY 10, 2001

- Tabled the report and recommendations on Multidisciplinary Practices.

APRIL 28, 2001

- No official action was taken.

SEPTEMBER 13, 2001

- Approved the recommendation to amend Rule 2.3(A), Method of Presentation, in the Permanent Rules of Procedure of the Representative Assembly.
- Approved the following by resolution adopted September 13, 2001:
IT IS RESOLVED that the Representative Assembly urges the Michigan Legislature, the Supreme Court, the State Bar, its Board of Commissioners and Staff to prioritize programs that educate voters as to the workings of our justice system and the background, experience and qualifications of candidates in judicial elections;
- That the State Bar endorses a system for the election of judges in all Michigan state courts which reduces, to the greatest degree possible, the politicization of judicial selection.

JANUARY 26, 2002

- Approved a resolution proposing an amendment to Rule 4.8 of the Permanent Rules of Procedure to annually update the Chronological Summary of the Representative Assembly Action and accompanying Index, and to provide both to each member at the Assembly's first meeting of the year.
- Approved a resolution proposing amendments to the Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct regarding the provision of ancillary and joint services by lawyers.
- Approved a resolution that (1) opposed the U.S. Department of Justice's proposed action to monitor communications between attorneys and their clients without prior judicial approval, which abrogates the attorney-client privilege; and (2) required that a copy of the resolution (as passed by the Assembly) be sent to the U.S. Attorney General and the Rules Unit of the Office of General Counsel, Bureau of Prisons.
- Approved a resolution (1) endorsing the January 4, 2002, Recommendations on Military Commissions issued by the American Bar Association Task Force on Terrorism and the Law and (2) requiring that copies of the resolution and Task Force Recommendations be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense and the American Bar Association.

APRIL 27, 2002

- Approved an amendment to Rule 2.3 of the Permanent Rules of Procedure of the Representative Assembly to clarify time for submission of items from the floor as follows:
 2.3 Method of Presentation. No item shall be placed on the calendar under sub-sections (3), (4), (5), (6), or (7) or (8) of Section 2.2 unless . . .
- Adopted the eleven criminal defense assigned counsel guidelines for improving public defense services, as proposed by the Michigan Public Defense Task Force.
- Adopted a resolution that (1) the Governor should call upon the State Bar of Michigan to assist in screening candidates for judicial appointments when vacancies occur and that no judicial appointment should be made by the Governor unless the State Bar of Michigan has received adequate time and opportunity to screen each candidate; and (2) the State Bar of Michigan should dedicate sufficient resources to continue its process of screening candidates for judicial appointments in a manner that is as fair and timely as possible.

SEPTEMBER 26, 2002

- Approved the following proposed resolutions as recommended by the Assembly Review Committee:
 1. That each State Bar Section Council be asked to accept an Assembly member as liaison, to be appointed by the Assembly Chairperson.
 2. That members of the Assembly who receive Committee appointments pursuant to Article VI, Section 2 of the Bylaws of the State Bar of Michigan and Rule 11 of the Supreme Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan shall act as Assembly Liaisons to the Committees and shall report back to the Assembly as needed.
 3. That Assembly meetings shall have space on the calendar for timely and pertinent informational reports from Sections and Committees of the State Bar of Michigan, and Sections and Committees shall be encouraged to present such reports to the Assembly.
 4. That members of the Representative Assembly should receive, on a regular and timely basis, information on all "policy" decisions made between Assembly meetings by the State Bar of Michigan Board of Commissioners.
- Tabled a recommendation to adopt amendments to the MRPC 6.1, pending review by the State Bar Standing Committee on Professional and Judicial Ethics. This proposal addresses pro bono service by lawyers.
- Deferred the Michigan Supreme Court Administrative Order No. 99-31 to the Assembly's Special Issues Committee. This proposal amends MCR 9.200, *et seq.*, regarding the judicial discipline system.

FEBRUARY 22, 2003

- Tabled proposed amendments to the Michigan Court Rules regarding challenges to medical malpractice notices of intent to sue, affidavits and expert witness qualifications; time for filing dispositive motions. The proposal was tabled for future consideration by the Assembly and referred back to the Civil Procedure & Courts Committee.
- Approved the following proposed resolutions as recommended by the Assembly Review Committee:
 1. To endorse the implementation of the Strategic Plan.
 2. To increase fees for the administration of licensing process.
 3. To increase the age from 70 to 75 at which active members are exempt from paying dues.
 4. To establish a \$15.00 annual assessment for the Client Protection Fund.
 5. To increase membership dues as amended by \$40.00 from (\$160 to \$200) effective in the 2003-04 fiscal year, and automatically increasing or decreasing dues based on the Consumer Price Index, beginning with the 2004-05 fiscal year unless otherwise ordered by the Supreme Court.

APRIL 26, 2003

- Adopted the proposed amendments to MCR 2.112, MCR 2.116 and MCR 2.401, as amended, regarding Challenges to Medical Malpractice Notices of Intent to Sue, Affidavits and Expert Witness Qualifications; Time for Filing for Dispositive Motions.

RESOLVED, that the State Bar of Michigan commends the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association for creating and adopting the Blueprint for Cost-effective Pretrial Detention Sentencing and Corrections Systems, and recommends consideration of the Blueprint provisions to the State of Michigan, federal and local governments, and all others seeking to take steps to eliminate unnecessary expenditures, enhance cost-effectiveness and promote justice.

- Rejected the proposed resolution in support of increasing federal judicial compensation as recommended by the National Commission on the Public Service ("Volcker Commission").

SEPTEMBER 12, 2003

- Adopted the following proposed amendment regarding mandatory minimum voting:
RESOLVED that the Board of Commissioners of the State Bar of Michigan is directed to amend Article IV Section 4 of the Bylaws of the State Bar of Michigan concerning the Representative Assembly by deleting the following sentences: "All ballots shall be voted for one-half or more of the number of Representatives to be elected from the circuits in that election. No ballot shall be counted which does not comply with this provision".
- Adopted the Assembly Review Committee's following recommendations:
 1. Issue an annual "Unsung Hero" Award
 2. Amend Rule 7.5 and 8.8 of the Permanent Rules of Procedure to read:
 - Nominating & Awards. The Nominating and Awards Committee shall consist of five (5) members, each of whom shall be from a different judicial circuit. The Committee shall perform the functions provided for in Rule 8.
 - 8.8 Awards. The Nominating and Awards Committee shall meet and recommend qualified members of the State Bar as recipients of the Michael Franck and Unsung Hero Awards, for vote by the Assembly.
- Adopted the recommendations of the State Bar of Michigan Appellate Delay Reduction Task Force.
- Adopted Special Procedure Rules (Part A) governing further debate on the proposed Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct and the Proposed Standards for Imposing Attorney Sanctions.

NOVEMBER 13, 2003 (SPECIAL MEETING)

- Adopted rules governing further debate on the proposed Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct and the Proposed Standards for Imposing Attorney Sanctions.
- Debated the recommendations of the Ethics Committee regarding proposed new Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct and Lawyer Discipline standards.

MARCH 27, 2004

- Opposed the adoption of the proposed amendments to MCR 2.112(K), Notice of Non-Party Fault.
- Approved the resolution in support of changes to court rules regarding issuance of ex parte guardianships over minors, subject to grammatical review by the Assembly Drafting Committee prior to submission to the Michigan Supreme Court.

OCTOBER 1, 2004

- Approved Appendix A under Section B, approved amendment to add attorneys with emeritus status to MCR 8.120 as a whole.
- Approved resolution for the Nominating and Awards Committee to determine annual recipients of the Michael Franck and Unsung Hero Awards, and recruit qualified individuals to fill Assembly vacancies.
- Approved amendment to Rule 2.2(7) calling for SBM hosted forum including all candidates for the Supreme Court Justice.

JANUARY 22, 2005

- Upon a motion made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned with all scheduled Proposals deferred to the April 16 meeting. Despite quorum, and out of respect for Assembly members unable to attend the meeting due to blizzard conditions, the Assembly determined that adjournment would ensure a substantive debate and ultimately recommendations to the Supreme Court from a truly representative body.
- After adjournment, a panel discussion regarding the Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct and Michigan Standards for Imposing Lawyer Standards was provided for attending Assembly members. Panelist included John Van Bolt, Don Campbell, John Allen, John Berry, and Anne-Marie Voice.

APRIL 16, 2005

- The Assembly approved amendments to MCR 2.403 as the Civil Procedure & Courts Committee recommended that the current case evaluation court rule be amended to limit its scope regarding automobile no fault benefit cases, to limit its scope to only expenses actually incurred and disputed before the case evaluation hearing due to the ongoing nature of these types of claims. The current rule provides that acceptance of a case evaluation award is deemed to dispose of all claims in an action.
- The Assembly approved amendments to MCR 3.602 as the Civil Procedure & Courts Committee recommended that the current arbitration court rule be amended to provide three procedural revisions: to substitute “motion” or “complaint” for “applicant” (an undefined term within the court rules or the Arbitration Act), clarify post-arbitration actions and set timing deadlines consistent with the Federal Arbitration Act.
- The Assembly approved the proposed Pro Hac Vice and Confidentiality Rules. Upon a motion made and seconded, the Assembly unanimously supported adding a new Rule Concerning the State Bar of Michigan governing *pro hac vice* practice and granting jurisdiction over out-of-state attorneys to the Attorney Grievance Commission and Attorney Discipline Board. The Assembly also voted in favor of the Rule incorporating provisions requiring out of state attorneys to affiliate with an active member of the State Bar who would appear of record in the proceeding, defining temporary practice as “no more than three separate representations within a 365-day period” and requiring a fee to be paid by out-of-state attorneys to cover State Bar administrative costs to monitor compliance. Upon a motion made and seconded the Assembly also voted in favor of adding a new Rule Concerning the State Bar of Michigan governing the confidentiality of State Bar programs, with the specific Rule to be submitted to the Assembly for approval.
- The Assembly unanimously approved to include a transition provision in the Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct within MRPC 1.0.2 (Applicability of Rules).
- The Assembly opposed including language in MRPC 1.4(c) (Communication) regarding the ownership and copying of lawyers’ files and records. A strong minority voted in favor of including language in the Rules.
- The Assembly opposed describing or incorporating a law enforcement exception within MRPC 4.2 (Communication with Party Represented by Counsel) or its comments. A minority voted in favor of a law enforcement exception.
- The Assembly approved including language in MRPC 1.5(f) (Fees) to specifically provide for enforceable nonrefundable retainers that are clearly identified and to which the client has consented in writing.
- The Assembly unanimously supported MRPC 1.15(c) (Safekeeping Property) such that nonrefundable fees comply with the factors set forth in the Assembly’s recommendation regarding MRPC 1.5(f).
- The Assembly unanimously approved that MSILS 1.3 should state the Standards are not intended to create independent grounds for determining culpability.
- The Assembly supported the Attorney Discipline Board’s definition of knowledge throughout the Standards, noting that “actual knowledge” should be used instead of “knowledge”.
- The Assembly supported specifically defining “injury” and “potential injury” within the MSILS Definitions, as proposed by the ADB. A strong majority supported the version of MSILS 2.3 as proposed by the Supreme Court and ADB. The Assembly unanimously supported considering injury in the first phase of the disciplinary system, when determining whether misconduct has occurred, rather than only in the second (sanction) phase, consistent with the ADB position.
- The Assembly supported Alternative A (the ADB version) regarding the use of reprimand within MSILS 4.6, 6.1 and 8.0, in favor of including reprimand as a disciplinary option for the forms of misconduct recognized by the Rules.
- The Assembly unanimously supported striking consent judgments from being governed by the Standards, as proposed by Robert Agacinski (personally) to the Supreme Court.
- The Assembly opposed the Standards providing for admonitions within MSILS 2.6, consistent with the ADB and AGC positions.
- The Assembly supported incorporating a two-prong test within the Standards requiring (1) injury or potential injury or (2) interference or potential interference with a legal proceeding, as a prerequisite to the issuance of sanctions pursuant to

MSILS 6.2 and 6.3, consistent with the ADB position.

- The Assembly supported limiting disbarment under MSILS 4.1 to a knowing “conversion” of “client property” rather than a failure to hold anyone’s property in trust, consistent with the ADB position. A majority of the Assembly supported limiting suspension to improper handling of client property that is knowingly or negligently improper, consistent with the ADB position. A slim minority supported the broader Campbell/Supreme Court version which would provide for suspension for the failure to hold property in trust or commingling personal property with property that should have been held in trust.
- The Assembly unanimously supported the ADB position regarding MSILS 4.3 (Failure to Avoid Conflicts of Interest); that a suspension sanction should require injury or potential injury to a client while reprimand should require the conflict to adversely affect another client and cause injury or potential injury to a client.
- The Assembly unanimously opposed providing sanctions for illegal or clearly excessive fees within MSILS 4.5 (Lack of Competence), consistent with the ADB position and Alternative A” published by the Supreme Court.
- The Assembly unanimously supported that, with regard to MSILS 5.1 (Failure to Maintain Personal Integrity), only a violation of a law that reflects adversely on a lawyer’s fitness to practice should be subject to discipline, consistent with the ADB position.
- The Assembly supported MSILS 3.2 (Isolated Acts of Negligence), such that isolated acts of negligence, without more, should not be the subject of discipline.
- The Assembly unanimously supported recommending that the Court publish a revised version of the Rules (AO-2003-62) for further analysis and comment to ensure a more thorough and comprehensive rewrite of Michigan’s Rules of Professional Conduct.

SEPTEMBER 22, 2005

- The E-Filing Task Force reported on a proposed amendment to the Michigan Court Rules, specifically MCR 2.107(C), regarding E-service between lawyers. The Assembly adopted the position that MCR 2.107(C) should be amended to allow attorneys to stipulate to serve documents upon each other via electronic mail.
- The Criminal Jurisprudence Committee reported on proposed amendment to MCR 2.107(G) regarding docketing receipts by mail. The Assembly unanimously approved the additional language to MCR 2.107(G) requiring the date that pleadings are filed, which includes filing by mail, to be noted on the docketing statement if different than the date docketed.
- The Criminal Jurisprudence Committee reported on proposed amendment to MCR 6.610(I), regarding notification of appellate rights in district court after misdemeanor convictions. The Assembly unanimously approved the amendment to MCR 6.610(I) removing the language “immediately after the judge imposes” and replacing that with “at the time of plea or.”
- The Criminal Jurisprudence Committee reported on a revised resolution for the proposed legislation to require electronic recording of Custodial Interrogations. The Assembly unanimously favored supporting in principle the use of video and audio recording of custodial interrogations as the best method of securing a precise and accurate record of custodial interrogations and calling for the appointment of a State Bar custodial interrogation recording task force consisting of State Bar members in the criminal defense, prosecution, judicial, and law enforcement communities to develop and promote legislative Court Rule and funding changes that advance the use statewide of audio and video electronic recording of custodial interrogations.
- The Unauthorized Practice of Law reported on the consideration of Multi-Jurisdictional Practice Report and Proposed Pro Hac Vice Rule (Rule 18). The Assembly adopted the proposed rule, which would designate the State Bar of Michigan as a central “clearinghouse” for Pro Hac Vice applications and would require an out of state attorney seeking Pro Hac Vice admission to pay a fee equivalent to the amount of dues and CPF assessment that active SBM members pay. Upon a motion made and seconded, the Assembly recommended Rule 18 to the Supreme Court for adoption.
- The Unauthorized Practice of Law reported on the consideration of Practice Management Resource Center Report & Proposed Confidentiality Rule (Rule 20). The Rule grants certain SBM programs formal confidentiality protection. Upon a motion made and seconded, the Assembly recommended Rule 20 to the Supreme Court for adoption.

APRIL 29, 2006

- The Justice Initiatives proposed revisions to MCR 2.402 (C). The first proposal is that the State Bar be authorized to have discussions with these interested stakeholders to find out what their approaches and concerns are, and if there is a consensus position about how to improve the rule, that the State Bar should be authorized to communicate that to the court. The Assembly unanimously approved the first revision to the proposed changes to MCR 2.402 (C).
- The second proposal was a technical change that the children aged 14 and older continue to receive notice of the proceedings affecting them, which is the current law, and just by the wording, inadvertently it looks like it could be the parent or the child, and that was not the intention. The Assembly unanimously approved the second revision to the proposed changes to MCR 2.402 (C).
- The Justice Initiatives proposed revisions to MRPC 6.1. In November 2003 the Assembly supported a voluntary standard which called for 30 hours of pro bono service or three cases per year or a contribution of \$300 for pro bono services on an annual basis. The proposal is to add two words, "or more" after "\$300". The Assembly unanimously approved the additional language to the proposal.
- Assembly Review Committee reported on a proposed revision to the Representative Assembly Permanent Rules of Procedure 4.8 to address timing as far as follow-up procedures concerning our proposals to the Supreme Court and adopting a procedure where our future officers and chairs will have some means to know what the Assembly has done in the past and what's out there still pending. After discussion and an amended motion, the Assembly opposed the proposal.
- Special Issues Committee of the Representative Assembly presented a proposal to adopt the strategic plan. Upon a motion made and seconded the Assembly adopted the amendments to the strategic plan.
- The Client Protection Fund reported on the Trust Account Overdraft Rule, which will be on the September agenda.
- The Michigan Law Revision Commission presented two proposals on the Michigan Law Revision Commission. After the motion was made and seconded, discussion followed, and the Assembly unanimously approved the State Bar of Michigan to take the policy position that the State of Michigan should pay the assessments it owes to the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws and pay the costs necessary to permit Michigan's uniform law commissioners to attend the NCCUSL's annual meeting.
- The second proposal is that the State Bar of Michigan's Board of Commissioners appoint and pay the expenses of a liaison to attend the NCCUSL annual meeting and report back to the chairperson of the Public Policy and Image Committee and chairperson of the Representative Assembly regarding events of the meetings for further dissemination to State Bar and committee chairperson. After discussion a motion was made and seconded that the Assembly unanimously approved the proposal.
- Family Law Section moved to adopt proposals regarding the Domestic Relations Court Rule, MCR. 3.222(B), MCR 3.201 and MCR 3.222(C-K) on behalf of the Family Law Section. MCR 3.222(B) is designed to facilitate the entry of the judgment of divorce or separate maintenance where a settlement has been reached prior to the commencement of litigation. Upon a motion that was made and seconded, the Assembly unanimously approved that MCR 3.222(B) should be added to the existing Michigan Court Rules to provide for non-litigious terminology in filings involving pre-settled divorce and separate maintenance cases with the exception that the word "shall" under 3.222(B) (8) be changed to "may."
- The Family Law Section moved that proposal MCR 3.201 be amended to include procedures that apply specifically to attorney-approved divorce and separate maintenance agreements that are signed before the divorce or separate maintenance case is filed. The motion was seconded and the Assembly unanimously approved MCR 3.201.
- The Family Law Section moved that proposal MCR 3.222 (C-K) should be added to provide for an applicable, streamlined approach to entry of judgments in filings involving pre-settled divorces and separate maintenance cases. The motion was seconded and, after discussion, "shall" was changed to "may" and the Assembly unanimously approved MCR 3.222 (C-K).
- Real Property Law Section reported on the proposed Resolution Regarding Gap between Filing and Recording of Deeds. The Real Property Law Section is requesting that the State Bar of Michigan support enforcement of the statutory requirement that county registers of deed maintain entry books pursuant to MCL 565.24. After discussion a motion was made to table. The Assembly unanimously agreed to table this matter.

SEPTEMBER 14, 2006

- The Representative Assembly unanimously approved that the Permanent Rules of Procedure regarding Awards 8.8 be amended whereby the Assembly will now vote on the recipients of the Michael Franck and Unsung Hero Awards at the April meeting of the Assembly, instead of the September meeting.
- The Special Issues Committee moved the Assembly suspend certain and amend certain parts of the Robert's Rules of Procedure for the debate on the Jury Reform Proposals. A motion was made and seconded. Accordingly, panelists will have floor privileges and will discuss the proposals that have been grouped in four different clusters. These clusters are: the Jury Reform Rules related to juror materials, proposals that affect juror participation, that affect the role of the judge, the role of the attorney, that affect the submission of evidence.
- The Special Issues Committee introduced the first cluster of proposals, dealing with proposals affecting juror materials, namely, trial notebooks, and preliminary and final instructions. Assembly members were able to ask the panelist questions and make comments before they began the group of clusters.

MCR 2.513(E) Reference Documents. The court ~~must encourage~~ may, in the court's discretion, allow counsel in civil and criminal cases to provide the jurors with a reference document or notebook, the contents of which ~~should~~ may include, but which is not limited to, witness lists, relevant statutory provisions, and, in cases where the interpretation of a document is at issue, copies of the relevant document. The court and the parties may supplement the reference document during trial with copies of the ~~preliminary~~ jury instructions and admitted exhibits, ~~and other appropriate information~~ to assist jurors in their deliberations.

PASSED AS EDITED 59-36

MCR 2.513(A) Preliminary Instructions. After the jury is sworn and before evidence is taken, the court shall provide the jury with pretrial 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 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 provide each juror with a copy of such instructions. MCR 2.512(D)(2) does not apply to such preliminary instructions.

PASSED

MCR 2.513(N)(2) Final Instructions to the Jury. Solicit Questions about Final Instructions. As part of the final jury instructions, the court ~~shall~~ may 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 the deliberations. Upon concluding the final instructions, the court ~~shall~~ may 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. The sealed envelope shall be made part of the record and preserved for appeal.

PASSED AS EDITED

MCR 2.513(N)(3) Copies of Final Instructions. The court ~~shall~~ may provide each juror with a written copy of the final jury instructions to take into the jury room for deliberation. The court, in its discretion, also may provide the jury with a copy of electronically recorded instructions.

PASSED AS EDITED

- Due to time considerations, the Assembly reviewed a different proposal before moving to the second cluster of Jury Reform proposals. Timothy O'Sullivan, Executive Director of the New York State Lawyers Fund for Client Protection introduced the proposed Rule for Trust Overdraft Notification, MRPC 1.15(A). After discussion a motion was made and seconded. The Assembly approved the proposal and authorized the State Bar of Michigan to make any subsequent editorial, clerical, or technical language changes to the proposed rule and comments that may assist in effecting the intent of the proposal after discussion with Michigan financial institutions and others prior to submitting the rule to the Michigan Supreme Court.
- Chairperson Buiteweg, introduced the second set of the Jury Reform Proposal clusters, dealing with juror participation. Assembly members were able to ask the panelist questions and make comments before they began the group of clusters.

MCR 2.513(F) Deposition Summaries. Where it appears likely that the contents of a deposition will be read to

the jury, the court should encourage the parties to prepare concise, written summaries of depositions for reading at trial in lieu of the full deposition. Where a summary is prepared, the opposing party shall have the opportunity to object to its contents. Copies of the summaries should be provided to the jurors before they are read.

FAILED UNANIMOUSLY

MCR 2.513(G) Scheduling Expert Testimony. The court may, in its discretion, craft a procedure for the presentation of al expert testimony to assist the jurors in performing their duties. Such procedures may include, but are not limited to: (1) Scheduling the presentation of the parties' expert witnesses sequentially; or (2) allowing the opposing experts to be present during the other's testimony and to aid counsel in formulating questions to be asked of the testifying expert on cross-examination; or (3) providing for a panel discussion by all experts on a subject after or in lieu of testifying. The panel discussion, moderated by a neutral expert or the trial judge, would allow the experts to question each other.

FAILED UNANIMOUSLY

- Chairperson Buiteweg introduced the third set of clusters, which this proposal dealt with a proposal permitting the court to comment upon the evidence. Assembly members were able to ask the panelist questions and make comments before they began the group of clusters.

MCR 2.513(M) Comment on the Evidence. After the close of the evidence and arguments of counsel, the court may fairly and impartially sum up the evidence and comment to the jury about the weight of the evidence, if it also instructs the jury that it is to determine for itself the weight of the evidence and the credit to be given to the witnesses and that jurors are not bound by the court's summation or comment. The court shall not comment on the credibility of witnesses or state a conclusion on the ultimate issue of fact before the jury.

FAILED UNANIMOUSLY

- Chairperson Buiteweg introduced the fourth set of clusters dealing with proposals affecting the role of the attorney. Assembly members were able to ask the panelist questions and make comments before they began the group of clusters.

MCR 2.513(J) Jury View. On motion of either party, on its own initiative, or at the request of the jury, the court may order a jury view of property or of a place where a material event occurred. The parties are entitled to be present at the jury view. ~~During the view, no person, other than an officer designated by the court, may speak to the jury concerning the subject connected with the trial. Any such communication must be recorded in some fashion.~~

PASSED WITH A VERY STRONG YES VOTE, ALTHOUGH NOT UNANIMOUS

MCR 2.513(I) Juror Questions. The court may permit the jurors to ask questions of witnesses. If the court permits jurors to ask questions, it must employ a procedure that ensures that such questions are addressed to the witnesses by the court itself, that inappropriate questions are not asked, and that the parties have an opportunity outside the hearing of the jury to object to the questions. The court shall inform the jurors of the procedures to be followed for submitting questions to witnesses.

PASSED 60 YES VOTES TO 40 NO VOTES

MCR 2.513(H) Note Taking by Jurors. The court may permit the jurors to take notes regarding the evidence presented in court. If the court permits note taking, it must instruct the jurors that they need not take notes, and they should not permit note taking to interfere with their attentiveness. If the court allows jurors to take notes, jurors must be allowed to refer to their notes during deliberations, but the court must instruct the jurors to keep their notes confidential except as to other jurors during deliberations. The court shall ensure that all juror notes are collected and destroyed when the trial is concluded.

PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

MCR 2.513(K) Juror Discussion. After informing the jurors that they are not to decide the case until they have heard all the evidence, instructions of law, and arguments of counsel, the court may instruct the jurors that they are permitted to discuss the evidence among themselves in the jury room during trial recesses. The jurors should be instructed that such discussions may only take place when all jurors are present and that such discussions must be clearly understood as tentative pending final presentation of all evidence, instructions and argument.

FAILED UNANIMOUSLY

MCR 2.513(D) Interim Commentary. Each party may, in the court's discretion, present interim commentary at appropriate junctures of the trial.

FAILED BY A SUBSTANTIAL MARGIN ALTHOUGH NOT UNANIMOUS

MCR 2.513(C) Opening Statements. Unless the parties and the court agree otherwise, the plaintiff or the prosecutor, before presenting evidence, must make a full and fair statement of the case and the facts the plaintiff or the prosecutor intends to prove. Immediately thereafter, or immediately before presenting evidence, the defendant may make a similar statement. The court may impose reasonable time limits on the opening statements.

PASSED

- The following proposals on the agenda: Emeritus Attorney Referral Fees, the Patient Compensation Act, MCR 2.519 pertaining to Special Masters and Electronic Discovery were tabled to the next meeting in April 2007.
- The Justice Initiatives reported on the consideration of Proposed Amendments to SCAO Garnishment Court Forms MC-13 and MC-14. Upon a motion made and seconded the Assembly unanimously approved the amendments to MC-13 and MC-14 to be revised to include a provision that expressly directs a bank or financial institution to protect SSI from garnishment. Upon a motion made and seconded the Assembly unanimously approved the amendments to cover the other forms of income, which would be SCAO garnishment form M-13 and garnish form M-14 to be revised to include a provision that expressly directs a bank or financial institution protect exempted income from garnishment.

APRIL 21, 2007

- The Senior Lawyers Section proposed whether Emeritus Members of the State Bar of Michigan should be entitled to receive referral fees so long as the Emeritus Members do not engage in the practice of law. After motion made and seconded, and discussion, the Assembly failed to pass the proposal.
- The Michigan Trial Lawyers Association presented a proposal to provide guidelines for specialized dockets. After motion made and seconded, and discussion and amendments, the proposal as amended was passed by the Assembly.
- The Civil Courts and Procedures Committee introduced for consideration the adoption of MCR 2.519 pertaining to special masters. After motion made and seconded, and discussion, the Assembly passed the proposal.
- The Civil Courts and Procedure Committee introduced for consideration the adoption of MCR 2.301, MCR 2.302, MCR 2.313, MCR 2.401 and MCR 2.506 dealing with electronic discovery rules. After motion made and seconded, and discussion and amendments, the Assembly passed the proposal as amended.

SEPTEMBER 27, 2007

- The Civil Procedure & Courts Committee reported on the consideration of the proposed amendments to the MCR 2.107 that would permit, upon stipulation of the parties, service by email. Below is a brief summary of the proposal that was approved.

In 2005, the Electronic Filing Task Force of the State Bar of Michigan ("SBM") submitted to the Representative Assembly a proposal that would amend MCR 2.107 by adding subsection (C)(4), which introduces the electronic service of papers by email. At its September 22, 2005 meeting, the Representative Assembly voted to recommend the amendment. On January 10, 2006, the SBM submitted proposed MCR 2.107(C)(4) to the Michigan Supreme Court. The Supreme Court made minor stylistic modifications to the proposed language and, on April 10, 2007, the Supreme Court published the proposed MCR 2.107(C)(4) for comments under ADM File No. 2007-12. The Supreme Court website received four comments. The deadline for submitting comments expired on August 1 and the Public Administrative Hearing scheduled to review this amendment was scheduled for September 26, 2007, one day before this Assembly's meeting. The Representative Assembly adopted the amendment to MCR 2.107(G) as proposed by the Civil Procedure & Courts Committee. The Attorney Client Privilege Task Force provided five proposals and the five proposals were all approved by a motion and then seconded. Below is a brief summary of the proposals that were approved.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION (1) – PRESERVATION OF ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGE AND WORK PRODUCT

The State Bar of Michigan supports the preservation of the attorney-client privilege and work product doctrine as essential to maintaining the confidential relationship between client and attorney required to encourage clients to discuss their legal matters fully and candidly with their counsel so as to (1) promote compliance with law through effective counseling, (2) ensure effective advocacy for the client, (3) ensure access to justice, and (4) promote the proper and efficient functioning of the American adversary system of justice; and that the State Bar of Michigan

opposes policies, practices and procedures of governmental bodies that have the effect of eroding the attorney-client privilege and work product doctrine and favors policies, practices and procedures that recognize the value of those protections. That the State Bar of Michigan opposes a routine practice by government officials of seeking to obtain a waiver of the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine through the granting or denial of any benefit or advantage.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION (2) – ATTORNEY CLIENT PRIVILEGE/GOVERNMENTAL INVESTIGATION AND PROSECUTION

That the State Bar of Michigan opposes government policies, practices and procedures that have the effect of eroding the constitutional and other legal rights of current or former employees, officers, directors or agents (“Employees”) by requiring, encouraging or permitting prosecutors or other enforcement authorities to take into consideration any of the following factors in making a determination of whether an organization has been cooperative in the context of a government investigation:

- (A) that the organization provided counsel to, or advanced, reimbursed or indemnified the legal fees and expenses of, an Employee;
- (B) that the organization entered into or continues to operate under a joint defense, information sharing and common interest agreement with an Employee or other represented party with whom the organization believes it has a common interest in defending against the investigation;
- (C) that the organization shared its records or other historical information relating to the matter under investigation with an Employee; or
- (D) that the organization chose to retain or otherwise declined to sanction an Employee who exercised his or her Fifth Amendment right against self-incrimination in response to a government request for an interview, testimony, or other information.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION (3) – DISCOVERY IN CLIENT REPRESENTATION AND MCR 2.302(B)

That the State Bar of Michigan supports amendment of the Michigan Court Rules (MCR) to restrict the compelled production of information relating to a lawyer’s representation of a client, or compelling testimony by a lawyer relating to a representation of a client, except upon a showing of exigent circumstances, or upon a showing of substantial need including exhaustion of efforts to obtain such information from other sources; and mandating the requesting party’s payment of the reasonable cost of production and testimony, including the value of any loss of working time; and that the State Bar of Michigan proposes the amendment of MCR 2.302(B) by adding subsection (B)(5) as follows:

Lawyers and Lawyers’ Files:

Compelling production of information relating to a lawyer’s representation of a client, or compelling testimony by a lawyer relating to a representation of a client, shall not be ordered, except upon a showing of exigent circumstances, or upon a showing of substantial need including exhaustion of efforts to obtain such information from other sources. The requesting party shall be responsible for payment to the lawyer for the reasonable cost of production and testimony, including the value of any loss of working time.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION (4) – INADVERTENT WAIVER OF THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE

That the State Bar of Michigan support the concepts contained in the American Bar Association (ABA) Resolution 120D on inadvertent waiver as adopted and that the issue be referred to the State Bar of Michigan Civil Procedure & Courts Committee for the drafting of appropriate rules in line with those concepts¹¹, and report back to the Representative Assembly.

PROPOSED RESOLUTION (5) – SELECTIVE WAIVER OF THE ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE

That the State Bar of Michigan opposes the concept of “selective waiver” of the attorney-client privilege and work product doctrine; and that the State Bar of Michigan opposes policies, practices and procedures of governmental bodies that purport to authorize and encourage “selective waiver” of the attorney-client privilege and work product doctrine; and that the State Bar of Michigan opposes a routine practice by government officials of seeking to obtain a waiver of the attorney-client privilege or work product doctrine through the offering of a purported agreement that the disclosed protected information will not be disclosed to others;

¹¹This analysis should also include consideration of the role of the expense of document review before production, especially in cases involving broad document requests, electronically stored information (ESI), and other factors that materially increase the burdens on the producing party.

and that the State Bar of Michigan opposes the adoption of proposed Federal Rule of Evidence (FRE) 502(c) incorporating the concept of "selective waiver."

APRIL 12, 2008

- A current member of the State Bar Board of Commissioners proposed that dues should be waived for members serving in the military. After motion made and seconded, and discussion, the Assembly approved the proposal.
- The proposal on the consideration of political and judicial endorsement by Assembly officers was withdrawn. This proposal went before the Board of Commissioners, and it was tabled. The Assembly will review the proposal once the Board of Commissioners takes action.
- The Justice Initiatives Committee introduced for consideration the adoption of ABA Model Court Rule on provision on legal services following determination of major disaster. The rule has two components, the first one is to address the legal needs of people who are displaced who may need pro bono assistance. The second part would deal with lawyers themselves. After motion made and seconded, and discussion, the Assembly approved the proposal.
- A Representative Assembly member introduced for consideration an amendment to MCR 6.201(B) regarding preservation of electronic recordings. After motions were made and seconded, and lengthy discussion, the Assembly tabled the proposal and referred to the Special Issues Committee.
- The proposal on the consideration of MCR 6.201 discovery to apply in misdemeanors and civil infractions, as well as felony cases was withdrawn.
- A Representative Assembly member introduced for consideration an amendment to MCR 6.425(C) mandating that copies of pre-sentencing reports be provided to the defendant and defense counsel. After motions were made and seconded, and lengthy discussion, the Assembly tabled the proposal and referred to the Special Issues Committee.
- A Representative Assembly member introduced for consideration an amendment to MCR 8.115, allowing the use of wireless cell phones and other communication devices by lawyers at state-level courthouses. After motion made and seconded, and discussion, the Assembly approved the proposal with amendments.
- A Representative Assembly member introduced for consideration of unauthorized practice of law education activities resolution to ensure that the State Bar can look at using its own resources to continue with the educational activities. After motion made and seconded, the Assembly approved the proposal and resolution.

SEPTEMBER 18, 2008

- A Representative Assembly member introduced for consideration an amendment to MCR 6.201(B) regarding preservation of electronic recordings. After motions were made and seconded, and lengthy discussion along with friendly amendments, the Assembly approved the proposal. The language of the proposed amendment as previously approved by the Representative Assembly now reads as follows:
RULE MCR 6.201 DISCOVERY
(B) Discovery of Information Known to the Prosecuting Attorney.
any electronic recording evidence made by any governmental agency or agent pertaining to the case known to the prosecuting attorney. Such records shall be preserved by the prosecuting attorney until after all appeals have been exhausted or all rights of appeal have expired, whichever date is later. Failure to preserve such evidence will entitle the accused to a jury instruction that such evidence not produced may be presumed by jurors to have been adverse to the prosecution.
- A Representative Assembly member introduced for consideration the proposal of political and judicial endorsement by Assembly officers. This proposal went before the Board of Commissioners in July and adopted a parallel policy, and pursuant to that policy, members of the Board are discouraged from personal endorsements during their term of office. The Executive Director of the State Bar of Michigan is prohibited from such endorsements. After a motion made and seconded, and discussion, the Assembly defeated the proposal.
- A Representative Assembly member referred the proposal to amend the Michigan Code of Judicial Conduct Canon 2 to the Special Issues Committee with specific instructions to seek comments from particular Sections that are involved, being Criminal Law; Family Law; General Practice; Judicial Conference; Legal Administrator; Litigation; Negligence; Prisons

and Corrections; Public Corporation Law; Civil Procedure & Courts Committee and the Criminal Jurisprudence & Practice Committee. After a motion and seconded, the motion was referred to the Special Issues Committee.

- A Representative Assembly member motioned to withdraw for consideration an amendment to MCR 6.425(C) mandating that copies of pre-sentencing reports be provided to the defendant and defense counsel.
- A Representative Assembly member introduced for consideration of MCR 6.425(B) presentence report, adding information to; adjournment allowed when not timely submitted before sentencing. After a motion and seconded, and some discussion, the Assembly approved the proposal.
- A Representative Assembly member introduced a second proposal at the same time for consideration of MCR 6.610(F), presentence report for district court. After a motion and seconded, the Assembly approved the proposal.

APRIL 18, 2009

- A Representative Assembly member introduced for consideration of proposed amendment of MCR 8.115, cell phone usage in court facilities. The Civil Procedure & Courts Committee asked for the Assembly's permission to advocate its own position on a proposal that the Assembly voted the previous year, on April 12, 2008. The Committee's position expands on the Assembly's position by inserting the below underlined language and striking other language from the Assembly's proposed amendment of MCR 8.115, regarding use of electronic devices in the courthouse:

(C) Electronic Devices. Lawyers may carry cell phones or other portable electronic devices, including but not limited to those with photographic, video or audio recording capabilities, into any court facility. ~~Cell phone or other portable electronic devices may be used~~ Such devices may be used ~~shall be allowed~~ anywhere outside the courtroom. When in any courtroom, all phones or other portable electronic devices shall either be turned off or silenced. If silenced, counsel shall make certain that any transmissions do not interfere with court proceedings. Individuals shall not verbally initiate or answer any calls while court is in session without the consent of the court. No photographs may be taken inside any courtroom without permission of the court. No photographs may be taken of any jurors or witnesses. ~~Individuals shall not initiate or answer any calls while court is in session without the consent of the court.~~ Nothing in this subrule limits the court's authority to impose other reasonable limitations on use of electronic devices where necessary to maintain conditions conducive to the orderly conduct of proceedings.

~~Failure to comply with this subrule section may result in a fine, incarceration, or both for contempt of court.~~

After a motion was made, seconded, and discussion, the Assembly granted permission to the Civil Procedure & Courts Committee to advocate its position.

- Representative Assembly member introduced for consideration an amendment to MCR 2.516 regarding instructions to the jury. The following is the alternative draft language proposed amendment of MCR 2.516 (B) regarding instructions to the jury:

MCR 2.516 Instructions to the Jury

(B) Instructing the Jury.

(1) After the jury is sworn and before evidence is taken, the court shall give such preliminary instructions regarding 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. MCR 2.516(D)(2) does not apply to such preliminary instructions. The court shall specifically instruct the jurors that they shall not:

- (a) discuss the case with others, including other jurors except as otherwise authorized by the court;
- (b) read or listen to any news reports about the case;
- (c) use a computer, cellular phone, or other electronic device with communication capabilities while in attendance at trial or during deliberation;
- (d) use a computer, cellular phone, other electronic device with communication capabilities, or any other means to obtain or disclose information about the case.. As used in this subsection, information about the case includes, but is not limited to, the following:
 - (A) seeking information about a party, , witness, or attorney involved in the case;
 - (B) reviewing news accounts of the case;
 - (C) conducting research on any topics raised or testimony offered by any witness;
 - (D) researching any other information the juror might think would be helpful.
- (e) Any juror who observes or has reason to believe that another juror has violated this rule shall immediately inform the court of the violation.

After motions were made, seconded, and discussion, the Assembly approved the proposal.

- Representative Assembly member introduced for consideration support for adoption in Michigan the Revised Uniform

Arbitration Act (RUAA) as drafted by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws (ULC) and supported with amendment by the Alternative Dispute Resolution Section of the State Bar of Michigan. After motions were made, seconded, and discussion, the Assembly referred the proposal to the Special Issues Committee of the Assembly.

SEPTEMBER 17, 2009

- Representative Assembly member and chair of the Special Issues Committee, addressed the Assembly on Canon 2(F), the hiring of court employees, which was referred to the Special Issues Committee in September 2008. What happened was that it was moved, seconded, and it was under discussion as the Special Issues Committee did not want to move forward with the proposal as written, and then the Assembly voted to refer it back to the Special Issues Committee to seek input from State Bar sections and committees, which the Special Issues Committee has done. Motion was made, should the Representative Assembly support and endorse a resolution to amend the Michigan Code of Judicial Conduct to add Section F to Canon 2 as proposed. Upon the motion made and seconded, the Assembly unanimously opposed the motion.
- Representative Assembly member and chair of the Special Issues Committee, addressed the Assembly with an update on consideration of the revised Uniform Arbitration Act. This was referred to the Special Issues Committee in April 2009 for further review, the Special Issues Committee voted to recommend deferral of the proposal until the spring 2010 meeting. The reason for that is that this proposal had been put forth by the Alternative Dispute Resolution Section in response to the work of the NCCUSL to come up with standard model language regarding the arbitration provisions. The ADR Section is in the process of providing more information and then to have informed debate on this matter at the next Assembly meeting.
- Board of Commissioners member addressed the Assembly on consideration of proposed amendment to MCR 6.302, pleas of guilty and nolo contendere. Motion was made MCR 6.302(C)(1), pleas of guilty and nolo contendere, be amended to mandate that all discussion regarding a defendant's plea take place in open court and be placed on record, as proposed in ADM No. 2009-11. Upon the motion made and seconded, the Assembly unanimously opposed the motion.
- Representative Assembly member and Family Law Section member, address the Assembly on the consideration of a proposed amendment on attorney solicitation, which was withdrawn. They have concerns with this proposal and will bring it back to the Assembly at a later date.

MARCH 27, 2010

- Co-Chair of the Justice Initiatives Committee introduced for consideration an amendment to MRPC 6.1 on voluntary pro bono services. The proposed resolution supports amendment and restatement of MRPC 6.1 and the elimination of the Voluntary Pro Bono Standard to accomplish the following:
 1. Combine the two State Bar statements of pro bono policy into one comprehensive statement;
 2. Expand the definition of pro bono while making it clear that the majority of pro bono effort must be directed to civil legal services for the poor;
 3. Clarify that contributions to the Access to Justice Fund and pro bono services provided through the Access to Justice Fund eligible programs will fulfill pro bono obligations;
 4. Encourage those lawyers who are financially able to do so to make a pro bono contribution of more than \$300 each year; and
 5. Maintain the voluntary nature of the rule.
 After a motion was made, seconded, the Assembly approved the proposal.
- Representative Assembly and member of the Family Law Section introduced for consideration an amendment to either the MRPC or the MCR regarding solicitation of potential Family Law clients by attorneys. After a motion was made, seconded, and discussion, the Assembly approved the amendment. The following with a friendly amendment is what was approved:

"In any matter involving a family law case in a Michigan trial court, a lawyer may not initiate contact or solicit a party for purposes of establishing a client-lawyer relationship, where the party and lawyer had no pre-existing family or client-lawyer relationship, until the first to occur of the following: service of process upon the party or fourteen (14) days has elapsed from the date of filing of the particular case."
- Krista Licata Haroutunian member of the Representative Assembly and Chair of the Special Issues Committee reported on the Revised Uniform Arbitration Act that was tabled at the September 17, 2009 meeting. The Special Issues Committee received comments from the Consumer Law Section, Family Law Section and the Alternative Dispute Resolution Section. The committee unanimously voted to collect more information from sections and bar associations to bring to the September 30, 2010 meeting.

SEPTEMBER 30, 2010

- Krista Licata Haroutunian member of the Representative Assembly and Chair of the Special Issues Committee addressed the Assembly on the formation of a new Standing Committee of Past Chairpersons of the Representative Assembly. The item was brought before the Special Issues Committee and members voted unanimously in favor of the formation of this committee in concept, which would allow for the utilization of institutional memory for this body. The Special Issues Committee asked that the Assembly as a whole to refer this concept to the Rules & Calendar Committee to allow for a more definitive outline, purpose, direction and bylaws changes. Upon the motion made to refer to the Rules & Calendar Committee and seconded, the Assembly unanimously passed the motion.
- Martin Krohner, Representative Assembly member and co-chair of the Criminal Issues Initiatives addressed the Assembly on the consideration for state legislation that would implement the Uniform Collateral Consequences Act. After discussion a motion was made and seconded that the Collateral Consequences of conviction be referred to the Special Issues Committee for more review.
- Michael Blau, Representative Assembly member, addressed the Assembly on consideration of a proposed resolution regarding Equal Access to Identification Documentation. The resolution is to support Equal Access to Identification Documentation; specifically, that the Secretary of State should promulgate an administrative rule reflecting the definition of legal presence so that eligible noncitizens may obtain state issued photo I.D.s to document their identity. After discussion a motion was made and seconded that the proposed resolution be referred to the Drafting Committee for review.
- John Mayer, Representative Assembly member, addressed the Assembly on consideration of a proposed resolution to the Michigan Campaign Finance Act requiring disclosure prior to a judicial election of the source of the funding for all expenditures for campaign advertising. After discussion a motion was made and seconded and the proposed resolution passed.

APRIL 9, 2011

- Michael Blau, Chair, Rules & Calendar Committee addressed the Assembly concerning the Representative Assembly Past Chairperson's Committee. At the September 2010 meeting the Assembly directed the Rules and Calendar Committee to develop the concept of a Past Chairpersons' Committee, including recommendation on the duties of the committee. After discussion a motion to create a Past Chairpersons' Committee was defeated.
- Krista Licata Haroutunian, Chair of the Special Issues Committee and member of the Assembly, addressed the Assembly concerning the Uniform Collateral Consequences of Conviction Act. This proposal was referred to the Special Issues Committee at the September 2010. The Committee unanimously supports the concept of a Uniform Collateral Consequences of Conviction Act. Upon a motion made and supported, it was proposed that the Assembly support and advocate for state legislation that implements a Collateral Consequences of Conviction Act. After discussion the motion passed.
- Josh Ard, Chair of the Drafting Committee and member of the Assembly, addressed the Assembly regarding the Equal Access to Court and Administrative Proceedings Proposal. This proposal was referred to the Drafting Committee at the September 2010 meeting for review and redrafting for clarification. The Committee presented the Assembly the following resolution for approval:

RESOLVED, that the State Bar of Michigan shall adopt a position in favor of the implementation of procedures or administrative rules designed to ensure that, upon application and payment or waiver of any applicable fee, an official state personal identification card is issued to any Michigan resident who is "legally present" in the United States (as that term is defined in MCL 28.291), and who otherwise qualifies for the card.

SEPTEMBER 15, 2011

- Daniel Quick, member of the Assembly and Civil Procedure & Courts Committee, addressed the Assembly concerning MCR 7.301(B) – Term of the Supreme Court, proposing to change the starting date of the Supreme Court from the current August 1 to January 1. After discussion a motion was made and supported to postpone this issue until the April 21, 2012 meeting.
- Martin Krohner, member of the Assembly, along with Past President Nancy Diehl and Valerie Newman of the State Appellate Defender's Office, addressed the Assembly in regard to the Establishment of an Eyewitness Identification Task Force. Upon a motion made and supported, it was proposed that the State Bar of Michigan appoint an Eyewitness Identification Task Force including State Bar members in the criminal defense, prosecution, judicial and law enforcement

communities, to develop and promote legislative and/or court rule changes that advance the improvement and reliability of eyewitness identification procedures. After discussion the motion passed.

- o Daniel Quick, member of the Assembly and Civil Procedure & Courts Committee, addressed the Assembly concerning MCR 2.302 – Discovery Only Depositions proposing the amendment of Michigan Court Rules to clarify the provisions regarding discovery only depositions by amending MCR 2.302(B) as follows:

Rule 2.302 General Rules Governing Discovery

(A) [Unchanged.]

(B) Scope of Discovery.

(1) – (3) [Unchanged.]

(4) Trial Preparation; Experts; Fees and Expenses. Discovery of facts known and opinions held by experts, otherwise discoverable under the provisions of subrule (B)(1) and acquired or developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial, may be obtained only as follows:

(a) Expert Expected to Testify.

(i) A party may through interrogatories require another party to identify each person whom the other party expects to call as an expert witness at trial, to state the subject matter about which the expert is expected to testify, and to state the substance of the facts and opinions to which the expert is expected to testify and ~~a summary of the grounds for each opinion.~~

(ii) A party may take the deposition of a person whom the other party expects to call as an expert witness at trial. In the absence of a stipulation or an order under this subrule (B)(4)(a)(ii), the deposition may be used for any purpose permitted under the Michigan Rules of Evidence. On written stipulation or on order, the deposition of an expert may be available for limited purposes, including that the deposition is for discovery only and may be used only for impeachment. The stipulation or order must specify the purposes for which the deposition may be used and provide for the allocation of the fees and expenses attributable to the deposition.

(iii) On motion, the court may order further discovery by other means, subject to such restrictions as to scope and such provisions ~~(pursuant to under~~ subrule [B](4)(c)] concerning fees and expenses as the court deems appropriate.

(a) Expert Not Expected to Testify. A party may not discover the identity of and facts known or opinions held by an expert who has been retained or specially employed by another party in anticipation of litigation or preparation for trial and who is not expected to be called as a witness at trial, except

(i) as provided in MCR 2.311, or

(ii) where an order has been entered on a showing of exceptional circumstances under which it is impracticable for the party seeking discovery to obtain facts or opinions on the same subject by other means.

(b) Fees and Expenses. ~~Unless manifest injustice would result~~

(i) ~~If a deposition is taken under a stipulation or order under subrule (B)(4)(a)(ii), the stipulation or order controls payment expenses and expert fees. the court shall require that the party seeking discovery under subrules (B)(4)(a)(ii) or (iii) or (B)(4)(b) pay the expert a reasonable fee for time spent in a deposition, but not including preparation time; and~~

(ii) In other cases, with respect to discovery obtained under subrule (B)(4)(a)(ii) or (iii), the court may require, and with respect to discovery obtained under subrule (B)(4)(b) the court shall require, the party seeking discovery to pay the other party a fair portion of the fees and expenses and expert fees reasonably incurred by the latter party in obtaining facts and opinions from the expert. Otherwise, the assessment or allocation of fees and expenses shall be reserved for determination after entry of judgment.

(c) Deposition for Use at Trial. A party may depose a witness that he or she expects to call as an expert at trial. The deposition may be taken at any time before trial on reasonable notice to the opposite party, and may be offered as evidence at trial as provided in MCR 2.308(A). The court need not adjourn the trial because of the unavailability of expert witnesses or their depositions.

(5)-(7) Unchanged.

Upon motion made, support and discussion the motion passes.

APRIL 21, 2012

- o Chairperson Gobbo addressed the Assembly focusing on a task that has been assigned to the Assembly Review Committee to review the operations of the Representative Assembly. Chairperson Gobbo also addressed the Assembly on the Practice of Law Definition.

- Chairperson Gobbo introduced the panelists, who said a few words on the Practice of Law Definition and answered questions from Assembly members. Panelist included Hon. Elwood Brown, Linda Rexer, Chris Hastings and Jim Harrington, III. Upon motion made and supported, after discussion, the definition of law was approved.
- Daniel Quick, Representative Assembly member withdrew the proposed Court Rule MCR 7.301(B) Terms of the Supreme Court. Upon motion made and supported, the proposed Court Rule was withdrawn.

SEPTEMBER 20, 2012

- Matthew Abel, member of the Assembly, addressed the Assembly concerning MCR 8.116 Mandatory Posting of Court Dockets by all courts. Upon motion made, support, discussion, and an amendment, the motion passed adding the following language to the court rule:

“Before each courthouse opens its doors to the public, all daily court dockets for all courts in the courthouse, excluding parties’ names in non-public cases, shall be displayed in a common place in the courthouse and in a manner that can be read easily by the general public.”
- Greg Ulrich, Chair, Master Lawyers Section and former Assembly Chair, made a presentation in partnership with the Young Lawyers Section on advance preparations for an attorney’s death or incapacity. A panel was available to answer questions after the presentation.

APRIL 27, 2013

- Edward Pugh, Former Chair, Master Lawyers Section, and Charles Rutherford, Chair, Fellows of the Michigan State Bar Foundation, addressed the Assembly on the proposed Inventory Rule to require a solo attorney to designate another “inventory attorney” to communicate and wind up the practice of the solo attorney if or when the solo attorney becomes incapacitated or deceased. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal was declined.
- John Mayer, Assembly member, addressed the Assembly on the proposed resolution to amend the Michigan Constitution to delete the prohibition on being appointed or elected to Judicial Office after age 70. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposed resolution to amend Section 19 of Article VI of the Michigan Constitution removing the age limitation, recommending that Judges over the age of 70 be permitted to run for election passed.
- Daniel Quick, Assembly member, addressed the Assembly on the proposed amendment of MCR 2.306 to prohibit electronic communication between a deponent and deponent’s attorney during direct exams and depositions. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposed amendment passed.
- Daniel Quick, Assembly member, addressed the Assembly on the proposed amendment of MRPC 7.1 on Law Firm Advertising. After discussion a motion was made and seconded to postpone to the September 2013 meeting.
- Daniel Quick, Assembly member, addressed the Assembly on the proposed amendment of MCR 2.203 Joining Additional Parties allowing third parties to be included on Summons and harmonize said procedure to harmonize practice with rule MCR 2.203(g). Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposed amendment passed.

SEPTEMBER 19, 2013

- Dan Quick, Assembly member addressed the Assembly for consideration of the proposed new MCR 2.602(B)(5) & (6) of the Michigan Court Rules. Upon a motion made and support, after discussion the Assembly referred the Proposed New Rule MCR 2.602(B)(5) & (6) of the Michigan Court Rules to the Drafting Committee, with suggested instructions that Section (B)(6) as originally proposed be deleted from the proposal.
- Daniel Quick, Assembly member, addressed the Assembly for consideration of proposed amendment of MRPC 7.2 Law Firm Advertising. Upon a motion made and support, after discussion and the amendment from the floor, which would add a requirement that advertising communication shall include the name of an active member in good standing of the State Bar of Michigan, or law firm name, who is responsible for the communication’s content the amendment passed.

APRIL 26, 2014

- Carl Chioini, Chair, Assembly Review Committee and Special Committee, addressed the Assembly on the consideration of recommendations and/or comments to the Michigan Supreme Court on Administrative Order No. 2014-5. In January 2014, the Senate introduced Bill 743 to eliminate the mandatory bar status of the State Bar of Michigan. The Board of

Commissioners took immediate action in February 2014 to oppose the bill, and requested the Supreme Court “initiate a review of how the State Bar operates within the framework of *Keller*.” The Supreme Court issued Administrative Order 2014-5, creating the Task Force on the Role of the State Bar of Michigan to determine whether or not the Bar’s dues and activities could be accomplished by means less intrusive on individual’s First Amendment rights in view of the *Falk* decisions. The order also provided that the Task Force would report on and include proposed revisions of the Court Rules governing the State Bar of Michigan. A motion was made that the Representative Assembly have a discussion on Administrative Order 2014-5 in order to make recommendations and/or provide comments to the Task Force. After no discussion, the motion passed.

- Kathleen M. Allen, Representative Assembly Chair, recommended three concepts for discussion: the governance on the role and function of the Representative Assembly; the definition of the type of policies on which the Board of Commissioners and the Representative Assembly decide, respectively; and how the Representative Assembly can function more effectively.
- Chairperson Allen formed a Special Committee comprised of the Assembly Review Committee, in addition to Krista Haroutunian, Eilisia Schwarz, and Robert LaBre, to put together recommendations and/or comments to the Task Force based on the April 26, 2014 discussion. Chairperson Allen also asked the Special Issues Committee to review the Assembly rules and submit comments to the Special Committee.
- Daniel D. Quick, Civil Procedure & Courts Committee, addressed the Assembly on a proposed amendment to MCR 2.602(B): an addition to subsection 5 to provide an expressed mechanism for the entry of consent judgments. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion and a friendly amendment, the proposal passed as follows:
 - (5) Upon presentation to the court of a proposed judgment, OTHERWISE LAWFUL, signed and approved by the parties bound by the judgment or their counsel of record, if an action is pending between those parties or was pending previously.
 - (a) If so provided in the proposed judgment, no notice to the opposing party of submission for entry is required, and submission of the judgment to the court for entry shall serve to re-open the prior case if closed.
 - (b) If the proposed judgment does not provide for entry without prior notice to the debtor, the submitting party must file a motion and give notice to the debtor under MCR 2.107(C) at least 14 days before the date of the motion hearing. The presenting party shall file and serve a notice of hearing for entry of the proposed judgment. If the debtor does not file and serve specific objections within that time, the court shall enter the judgment.
 - (c) The proposed judgment must be accompanied by an affidavit of the submitting party or its counsel averring as to the basis for entry of the judgment.
 - (d) Service of the entered judgment shall be as provided for in the judgment or else in accordance with MCR 2.602(D) and the manner prescribed in MCR 2.105. Within 21 days of service, the judgment debtor may file a motion to challenge the propriety of the entry of the judgment or the calculation of the judgment amount. The motion must be heard within 14 days of filing. The filing of such a motion does not extend the stay of MCR 2.614(A)(1) or prevent the court from enjoining the transfer of assets under MCR 2.621(C). The court may modify or set aside the judgment or enter such other relief as it deems appropriate.
- Daniel D. Quick, Civil Procedure & Courts Committee, addressed the Assembly on a proposed amendment to MCR 2.305(A)(1) to clarify that a subpoena cannot be issued in a case until the guidelines of MCR 2.306(A)(1) have been met. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion and a friendly amendment, the proposed amendment passed as follows:
 - Rule 2.305 Subpoena for Taking Deposition
 - (A) General Provisions.
 - (1) Subpoenas SHALL not be issued except in compliance with MCR 2.306(A)(1). After serving the notice provided for in MCR 2.303(A)(2), 2.306(B), or 2.307(A)(2), a party may have a subpoena issued in the manner provided by MCR 2.506 for the person named or described in the notice. Service on a party or a party’s attorney of notice of the taking of the deposition of a party, or of a director, trustee, officer, or employee of a corporate party, is sufficient to require the appearance of the deponent; a subpoena need not be issued.
- Daniel D. Quick, Civil Procedure & Courts Committee, addressed the Assembly on a proposed amendment to MCR 2.003(D)(3)(a) to clarify a chief judge who has also been disqualified on a case. Upon a motion made and supported, the proposed amendment passed as follows:
 - Rule 2.003 Disqualification of Judge
 - (A) Procedure...
 - (3) Ruling.

- (a) For courts other than the Supreme Court, the challenged judge shall decide the motion. If the challenged judge denies the motion, on the request of a party,
 - (i) in a court having two or more judges and if the chief judge is not disqualified on the case, the challenged judge shall refer the motion to the chief judge, who shall decide the motion de novo;
 - (ii) in a single-judge court, or if the challenged judge is the chief judge, or if the chief judge is disqualified on the case, the challenged judge shall refer the motion to the state court administrator for assignment to another judge, who shall decide the motion de novo.
- Daniel D. Quick, Civil Procedure & Courts Committee, addressed the Assembly on a proposed modification to MCR 2.403(G)(1). The recommendation called for the advance notice of the names of the case evaluators before showing up at a case evaluation. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposed modification passed as follows:
 Rule 2.403 Case Evaluation
 (G) Scheduling Case Evaluation Hearing.
 (1) The ADR clerk shall set a time and place for the hearing and send notice to the case evaluators and the attorneys at least 42 days before the date set. The notice shall also contain the names of the case evaluators. If, for any reason, the ADR Clerk appoints a replacement case evaluator after the date the notice is sent, then the ADR Clerk shall send an amended notice to the case evaluators and the attorneys, including the name of the replacement evaluator, within a reasonable time but in any event before the hearing.

SEPTEMBER 18, 2014

- Michael Blau, Representative Assembly member, and Lorrain S.C. Brown, co-chair of Justice Policy Initiative, addressed the Assembly for consideration of proposed amendment of MCR 7.109 to allow an indigent person to move for the waiver of transcript fees on appeals from agency decisions. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed as follows:
 MCR 7.109.
 (B) Transcript.
 (1) Appellant's Duties; Orders; Stipulations.
 (a) The appellant is responsible for securing the filing of the transcript as provided in this rule. Unless otherwise provided by circuit court order or by subrule (f), or this subrule, the appellant shall order the full transcript of testimony and other proceedings in the trial court or agency. Under MCR 7.104(D)(2), a party must serve a copy of any request for transcript preparation on the opposing party and file a copy with the circuit court.
 * * *
 (f) If the court finds that the appellant from an agency decision is financially unable to pay for the preparation of transcripts for appeal, the court must order transcripts prepared at public expense.

APRIL 25, 2015

- Kimberly A. Breitmeyer, Chair, Assembly Review Committee, addressed the Assembly on a proposed amendment to the Representative Assembly Permanent Rules of Procedure—5.1 Voting, to clarify the ability of the Assembly to vote using electronic devices. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion and several friendly amendments, the proposal passed 94 to 14 as follows:
5.1 Voting. Unless a written ballot is required, Voting-voting shall be by voice vote or electronic tally at the option of the chair. unless a written ballot is required or the members stand and are counted If by voice vote, when the chair is in doubt provided however, that a roll call vote, either by voice or an electronic vote, shall be taken and a record kept. thereof to indicate the individual vote of each participating Representative Assembly member. If a division is requested as to the voice vote any time a request for such vote is made and supported by at least twenty (20) members of the Representative Assembly, or when a position is to be taken on proposed legislation and the position of the Assembly is not unanimous, a roll call vote, either by voice or an electronic vote, shall be taken and a record kept. to indicate the individual vote of each participating Representative Assembly member.
- Kimberly A. Breitmeyer, Chair, Assembly Review Committee, addressed the Assembly on a proposed amendment to the Representative Assembly Permanent Rules of Procedure—4.4 Minority Reports, to provide a minority report to accompany recommendations to the Michigan Supreme Court. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion and several friendly amendments, the proposal passed 96 to 10 as follows:
4.4 Section-Minority Reports. A section-minority report is a written report stating the views of less than half the members of a section, section council or a committee on a recommendation of the majority report-of the section. The content of the minority report must reflect the minority. Minority-views must have been presented to

the section, section council or committee orally or in writing at the time it acted on the matter, unless the section, section council or committee did not notify its members in advance that the matter would be considered. The report must be printed at the request of its proponents over their signatures and ~~appended~~ to the report to which it relates.

Representative Assembly Minority Reports. Members of the Representative Assembly voting in the minority on a proposal to be submitted to the Michigan Supreme Court may collectively submit a minority report to accompany State Bar recommendations to the Michigan Supreme Court, if the majority proposal has been adopted by less than 75% of the members present and voting. The content of the minority report must be limited to the views presented on the floor of the Assembly meeting during the debate on the merits of the proposal. A member of the Assembly must invoke this rule by making a motion request for the submission of a minority report immediately following the vote on the following the proposal from which the minority report dissents have been adopted, and must identify the author(s) of the minority report. The length of the report may not exceed that of the majority and must be submitted to the Clerk within 14 days of the conclusion receipt of the transcript of the meeting at which the motion passed. The Clerk must review the report with the drafting committee to ensure compliance with the word limitations and reasonable consistency with the minority opinions expressed during the debate on the recommendations and largely reflected in the transcript of the proceedings. The Clerk and drafting committee, in consultation with the author of the minority report, shall have the final decision on the draft of the minority report submitted.

- Kimberly A. Breitmeyer, Chair, Assembly Review Committee, addressed the Assembly on a proposed amendment to the Representative Assembly Permanent Rules of Procedure—5.1 Voting-Keller, to require that the Assembly implement a voting process to ensure that actions conform to *Keller v. State Bar of California* and subsequent governing and/or authoritative law on the constitutional standard for mandatory bar advocacy. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion and a friendly amendment, the proposal passed 77 to 25, with 2 abstentions, as follows:

5.1 Voting. Voting shall be by voice vote, unless a written ballot is required or the members stand and are counted when the chair is in doubt or a division is requested provided however, that a roll call vote shall be taken and a record kept thereof any time a request for such vote is made and supported by at least twenty (20) members of the Representative Assembly, or when a position is to be taken on proposed legislation and the position of the Assembly is not unanimous.

5.1.1 Keller Vote. Any proposal to be submitted for a vote, which has potential Keller implications, ~~where applicable~~, shall first be submitted to counsel and/or bar staff, as applicable, who is not a member of the Representative Assembly, for an independent opinion as to the permissibility of the vote by the Representative Assembly on the merits of such proposal under *Keller v. State Bar of California* and subsequent governing and/or authoritative law on the constitutional standard for mandatory bar advocacy (collectively, “Keller”). The opinion of counsel and/or bar staff, as applicable, should articulate the reasoning behind the determination and accompany the applicable proposal at the time of publication pursuant to Section 2.5 of these Rules. A “Keller Vote” shall be taken prior to the Representative Assembly taking a position on proposals, where applicable, to determine the permissibility of the vote under Keller. A two-thirds vote of the members of the Representative Assembly present is required to support a determination that a vote on the proposal is permissible.

OCTOBER 5, 2015

- Karen H. Safran, Chair of the Civil Procedure & Courts Committee, addressed the Assembly for consideration of proposed amendments to MCR 2.116 and MCR 2.119 to adjust the timing of dispositive motions to allow for reply briefs, and to clarify that reply briefs are not allowed for any other motions unless leave is given by the Court. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed 54 to 42 as follows:

Rule 2.116 Summary Disposition

(A) – Unchanged

(B) Motion

(1) - Unchanged

(2) A motion under this rule may be filed at any time consistent with subrule (D) and subrule (G)(1), but the hearing on a motion brought by a party asserting a claim shall not take place until at least ~~28-35~~ days after the opposing party was served with the pleading stating the claim.

(C) – (F) – Unchanged

(G) Affidavits; Hearing.

(1) Except as otherwise provided in this subrule, MCR 2.119 applies to motions brought under this rule.

(a) Unless a different period is set by the court,

(i) a written motion under this rule with supporting brief and any affidavits must be filed and served at least ~~21-28~~ days before the time set for the hearing, and

(ii) any response to the motion (including brief and any affidavits) must be filed and served at least 7-14 days before the hearing.

(iii) the moving party or parties may file a reply brief in support of the motion. Reply briefs must be confined to rebuttal of the arguments in the nonmoving party or parties' response brief and must be limited to 10 pages. The reply brief must be filed and served at least 7 days before the hearing.

(iv) no additional or supplemental briefs may be filed without leave of the court.

(b) If the court sets a different time for filing and serving a motion, ~~or a response, or a reply brief,~~ its authorization must be endorsed in writing on the face of the notice of hearing or made by separate order.

(c) A copy of a motion, ~~or response (including brief and any affidavits), or reply brief~~ filed under this rule must be provided by counsel to the office of the judge hearing the motion. The judge's copy must be clearly marked JUDGE'S COPY on the cover sheet; that notation may be handwritten.

Rule 2.119 Motion Practice

(A) Form of Motions

(1) – Unchanged

(2) A motion or response to a motion that presents an issue of law must be accompanied by a brief citing the authority on which it is based.

(a) Except as permitted by the court, the combined length of any motion and brief, or of a response and brief, may not exceed 20 pages double spaced, exclusive of attachments and exhibits.

(b) Except as permitted by the court or as otherwise provided in these rules, no reply briefs, additional briefs, or supplemental briefs may be filed.

(c) Quotations and footnotes may be single-spaced. At least one-inch margins must be used, and printing shall not be smaller than 12-point type.

(d) A copy of a motion or response (including brief) filed under this rule must be provided by counsel to the office of the judge hearing the motion. The judge's copy must be clearly marked JUDGE'S COPY on the cover sheet; that notation may be handwritten.

-
- Robert F. Gillett, Member of the Committee on Justice Initiatives, and Valerie R. Newman, Member of the Committee on Justice Initiatives, addressed the Assembly for consideration of proposed amendments to MCR 3.605, MCR 3.606, MCR 3.928, MCR 3.944, MCR 3.956, MCR 6.001, MCR 6.425, MCR 6.445, MCR 6.610, and MCR 6.933 to address the issue of sentencing indigent litigants to jail or prison for the failure to pay court-ordered fees, fines or costs without a prior determination of the ability to pay. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed 92 to 10 (with 1 abstention) as follows:

Rule 3.605 – Collection of Penalties, Fines, Forfeitures, and Forfeited Recognizances

(A) – (C) Unchanged

(D) Remission of Penalty. An application for the remission of a penalty, including bond forfeiture, may be made to the judge who imposed the penalty or ordered the forfeiture. The application may not be heard until reasonable notice has been given to the prosecuting attorney (or municipal attorney) and he or she has had an opportunity to examine the matter and prepare to resist the application. The application may be granted without payment of the costs and expenses incurred in the proceedings for the collection of the penalty, unless ordered by the court.

Rule 3.606 – Contempts Outside Immediate Presence of Court

(A) – (E) Unchanged

(F) The court shall not sentence a person to a term of incarceration unless the court has complied with the provisions of MCR 6.425 (E)(3), notwithstanding proceedings pursuant to the Child Support and Parenting Time Enforcement Act, MCL 552.602 et seq.

Rule 3.928 – Contempt of Court

(A) – (C) Unchanged

(D) Determination of Ability to Pay. A juvenile and/or parent shall not be detained or incarcerated for the nonpayment of court ordered financial obligations as ordered by the court, unless the court determines on the record that the juvenile and/or parent has the resources to pay and has not made a good-faith effort to do so.

Rule 3.944 – Probation Violation

(A) – (E) Unchanged

(F) Determination of Ability to Pay. A juvenile and/or parent shall not be detained or incarcerated for the nonpayment of court ordered financial obligations as ordered by the court, unless the court determines on the record that the juvenile and/or parent has the resources to pay and has not made a good-faith effort to do so.

Rule 3.956 – Review Hearings; Probation Violation

(A) – (B) Unchanged

(C) Determination of Ability to Pay. A juvenile and/or parent shall not be detained or incarcerated for the nonpayment of court ordered financial obligations as ordered by the court, unless the court determines on the record that the juvenile and/or parent has the resources to pay and has not made a good-faith effort to do so.

Rule 6.001 – Scope; Applicability of Civil Rules; Superseded Rules and Statutes

(A) Unchanged

(B) Misdemeanor Cases. MCR 6.001-6.004(B) and (C), 6.006, 6.102(D) and (F), 6.106, 6.125, 6.202, 6.425(E)(3), 6.427, 6.445(A)-(G), and the rules in subchapters 6.600-6.800 govern matters of procedure in criminal cases cognizable in the district courts.

Rule 6.425 – Sentencing; Appointment of Appellate Counsel

(A) – (D) Unchanged

(E) (1)-(2) Unchanged

(3) Incarceration for Nonpayment.

(a) The court shall not sentence a defendant to a term of incarceration, nor revoke probation, for failure to comply with a court order to pay financial obligations, unless the court determines on the record that the defendant is able to comply with the order without manifest hardship and that the defendant has not made a good-faith effort to comply with the order.

(b) Payment alternatives. If the court determines on the record that the defendant is unable to comply with a court order to pay financial obligations without manifest hardship, the court may impose a payment alternative, such as a payment plan, modification of any existing payment plan, or waiver of part or the entire amount of money owed to the extent permitted by law.

(c) Determining manifest hardship. The court shall consider the following criteria in determining manifest hardship:

(i) Defendant's employment status and history.

(ii) Defendant's employability and earning ability.

(iii) The willfulness of the defendant's failure to pay.

(iv) Defendant's financial resources.

(v) Defendant's basic living expenses, including but not limited to food, shelter, clothing, necessary medical expenses, or child support.

(vi) Any other special circumstances that may have bearing on the defendant's ability to pay.

Rule 6.445 – Probation Revocation

(A) – (F) Unchanged

(G) Sentencing. If the court finds that the probationer has violated a condition of probation, or if the probationer pleads guilty to a violation, the court may continue probation, modify the conditions of probation, extend the probation period, or revoke probation and impose a sentence of incarceration. The court may not sentence the probationer to prison without having considered a current presentence report. The court may not sentence the probationer to prison or jail for failing to pay fines, costs, restitution, and other financial obligations imposed by the court without and having complied with the provisions set forth in MCR 6.425(B) and (E).

Rule 6.610 – Criminal Procedure Generally

(A) – (E) Unchanged

(F) (1) Unchanged

(2) The court shall not sentence a defendant to a term of incarceration for nonpayment unless the court has complied with the provisions of MCR 6.425(E)(3).

(23) Unless a defendant who is entitled to appointed counsel is represented by an attorney or has waived the right to an attorney, a subsequent charge or sentence may not be enhanced because of this conviction and the defendant may not be incarcerated for violating probation or any other condition imposed in connection with this conviction.

(34) Immediately after imposing a sentence of incarceration, even if suspended, the court must advise the defendant, on the record or in writing, that:

Rule 6.933 – Juvenile Probation Revocation

(A) – (D) Unchanged

(E) Determination of Ability to Pay. A juvenile and/or parent shall not be detained or incarcerated for the nonpayment of court ordered financial obligations as ordered by the court, unless the court determines on the record that the juvenile and/or parent has the resources to pay and has not made a good-faith effort to do so.

-
- John P. Mayer, Member of the Representative Assembly, addressed the Assembly for consideration of SJR J and HJR S, two resolutions calling for an amendment to Section 19 of Article VI of the Michigan Constitution of 1963 to remove and/or increase the age limitation eligibility criteria for judicial office. As required by the Permanent Rules of Procedure 5.1.1, the Assembly conducted a vote on the whether the proposals were permissible for a vote under *Keller v. State Bar of California*; the Keller permissibility passed 82 to 12 (with 4 abstentions). Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the Assembly voted 71 to 37 (with 2 abstentions) to support SJR J; and 57 to 49 (with 3 abstentions) to support HJR S.

APRIL 30, 2016

- Karen H. Safran, Chair of the Civil Procedure & Courts Committee, addressed the Assembly for consideration of proposed amendments to MCR 8.119 to provide that a protective order issued under MCR 2.302(C) governs the process for filing discovery materials under seal and make it clear that anyone can still petition the court to lift the sealing and see the documents that were filed under seal. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed 90 to 2 as follows:
 - Rule 8.119 Court Records and Reports; Duties of Clerks
 - (A) – (H) – Unchanged
 - (I) Sealed Records.
 - (1) – (3) - Unchanged
 - (4) ~~For purposes of this rule, “court records” includes all documents and records of any nature that are filed with the clerk in connection with the action. Nothing in this rule is intended to limit the court’s authority to issue protective orders pursuant to MCR 2.302(C). Materials that are subject to a motion to seal a record in whole or in part shall be held under seal pending the court’s disposition of the motion.~~
 - (5) For purposes of this rule, “court records” includes all documents and records of any nature that are filed with the clerk in connection with the action.
 - ~~(5)(6)~~ A court may not seal a court order or opinion, including an order or opinion that disposes of a motion to seal the record.
 - (7) Whenever the court grants a motion to seal a court record, in whole or in part, the court must forward a copy of the order to the Clerk of the Supreme Court and to the State Court Administrative Office.
 - ~~(8) Nothing in this rule is intended to limit the court’s authority to issue protective orders pursuant to MCR 2.302(C) without a motion to seal or require that a protective order issued under MCR 2.302(C) be filed with the Clerk of the Supreme Court and the State Court Administrator’s Office. A protective order issued under MCR 2.302(C) may authorize parties to file materials under seal in accordance with the provisions of the protective order without the necessity of filing a motion to seal under this rule.~~
 - ~~(6)(9)~~ Any person may file a motion to set aside an order that disposes of a motion to seal the record, ~~to unseal a document filed under seal pursuant to MCR 2.302(C),~~ or an objection to entry of a proposed order. MCR 2.119 governs the proceedings on such a motion or objection. If the court denies a motion to set aside the order or enters the order after objection is filed, the moving or objecting person may file an application for leave to appeal in the same manner as a party to the action. See MCR 8.116(D).
 - ~~(7) Whenever the court grants a motion to seal a court record, in whole or in part, the court must forward a copy of the order to the Clerk of the Supreme Court and to the State Court Administrative Office.~~
-
- George M. Strander, Member of the Civil Procedure & Courts Committee, addressed the Assembly for consideration of proposed amendments to MCR 5.125 to accommodate the service of minor guardianship reports. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed 81 to 6 as follows:
 - Rule 5.125 Interested Person Defined
 - (A) – (B) – Unchanged
 - (C) Specific Proceedings.
 - (1) – (22) - Unchanged
 - (23) The persons interested in receiving a copy of the report of a guardian of a minor, or of a legally incapacitated individual, on the condition of the ward are:
 - (a) the ward, if 14 years of age or older;
 - (b) the person who has principal care and custody of the ward, if other than the guardian;
 - (c) for an adult guardianship, the spouse and adult children or, if no adult children are living, the presumptive heirs of the individual;
 - (d) for a minor guardianship, the parents of the minor or, if neither of them is living, any grandparents and the adult presumptive heirs of the minor.
 - (24) – (33) - Unchanged

- Jules B. Olsman, on behalf of the Civil Procedure & Courts Committee, addressed the Assembly for consideration of proposed amendments to MRPC 7.2. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed 85 to 6 as follows:
 - Rule: 7.2 Advertising
 - (a) Subject to the provisions of these rules, a lawyer may advertise.
 - (b) A copy or recording of an advertisement or communication shall be kept for two years after its last dissemination along with a record of when and where it was used.
 - (c) A lawyer shall not give anything of value to a person for recommending the lawyer's services, except that a lawyer may:
 - (i) pay the reasonable cost of advertising or communication permitted by this rule;
 - (ii) participate in, and pay the usual charges of, a not-for-profit lawyer referral service or other legal service organization that satisfies the requirements of Rule 6.3(b); and
 - (iii) pay for a law practice in accordance with Rule 1.17.
 - (d) Services of a lawyer or law firm that are advertised under the heading of a phone number, web address (i.e. law.com), image, or icon shall identify the lawyers or law firm providing the services. Any web site advertising the services of a lawyer or law firm must contain the name(s) of the attorney(s) providing the services.

SEPTEMBER 22, 2016

- Kenneth M. Mogill, Chair of the Professional Ethics Committee, addressed the Assembly for consideration of proposed amendments to the Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct to add new MRPC 1.18 and its comments, and revisions to MRPC 7.3 and its comments for consistency with the terminology of Rule 1.18. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed 71 to 16.
- Kenneth M. Mogill, Chair of the Professional Ethics Committee, addressed the Assembly for consideration of proposed amendments to MRPC 4.4 add subsection (b) of the ABA Model Rules and the associated commentary. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed 79 to 12.
- Robert B. Ebersole, Chair of the Character & Fitness Committee, addressed the Assembly for consideration of proposed amendments to Rule 15 of the Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan to increase the character and fitness investigation fee to \$375 from the current fee of \$225 and increase the late application fee to \$175 from the current fee of \$100. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed 76 to 17 with 1 abstention.
- Edward H. Pappas, Linda K. Rexer, and Erika L. Davis, representing the 21st Century Practice Task Force, addressed the Assembly for consideration of proposed amendments to MCR 2.107, MCR 2.117, and MCR 6.001 and MRPC 1.0, MRPC 1.2, MRPC 4.2, and MRPC 4.3 to provide direction concerning the advancement of limited scope representation in Michigan. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed 78 to 15.
- Bernard A. Jocus, Chair of the Marijuana Law Section, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to MRPC 1.2(c) to permit lawyers to counsel or assist clients in legal matters permitted under the Michigan Medical Marihuana Act (MMMA) or other laws relating to marijuana that may in the future be adopted (collectively, the Marijuana Laws) as long as: (1) the Marijuana Laws have not been held to be preempted, void, or invalid; (2) the lawyer reasonably believes the client's conduct is allowed under the Marijuana Laws; and (3) the lawyer advises the client about the federal law implications. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed 80 to 16.
- Bernard A. Jocus, Chair of the Marijuana Law Section, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to MRPC 8.4(b) and related Comments to make clear that a lawyer or prospective lawyer's use of marijuana in accordance with applicable State law shall not constitute professional misconduct. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed 71 to 27 and 1 abstention, with one amendment spelling "marihuana" with an H.
- John A. Hubbard, member of the Assembly and representing the 21st Century Practice Task Force, and Kenneth M. Mogill, Chair of the Professional Ethics Committee, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a resolution to direct the State Bar of Michigan to develop an efficient and effective process to make attorney malpractice coverage information readily available to legal consumers. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal failed 10 to 86.
- John A. Hubbard, member of the Assembly and representing the 21st Century Practice Task Force, addressed the Assembly for consideration for the State Bar of Michigan to create a lawyer specialty certification program and a Standing Committee on Specialty Certification to support specialty practice in the 21st Century. Upon a motion made and

supported, after discussion, the proposal failed 37 to 57 with 2 abstentions.

APRIL 22, 2017

- Karen H. Safran, Chair of the Civil Procedure & Courts Committee, addressed the Assembly for re-consideration of proposed amendments to MCR 2.116 and MCR 2.119 as published in Administrative File Number 2015-24. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the Assembly supported commenting on the published file number, recommending that the briefing schedule be extended one week as originally proposed by the Assembly.
- Nicholas M. Ohanesian, Member of the Professional Ethics Committee, addressed the Assembly for consideration of proposed amendments to MRPC 7.1 to add paragraphs regarding the use of a “retired” or “former” title for lawyers who are retired or former justices, judges, referees, and magistrates. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed.
- Lori A. Buiteweg, past president of the State Bar of Michigan, addressed the Assembly for consideration of approval of the State Bar of Michigan Strategic Plan for 2017-2020. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal supported the Strategic Plan.

SEPTEMBER 28, 2017

- Judge Angela K. Sherigan, Chair of the American Indian Law Committee, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a resolution calling for an amendment to the Michigan Court Rules to broaden and clarify the scope of direct appeals of orders in violation of specific provisions of ICWA (25 USC 1914) and MIFPA (MCL 712B.39). Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed.

APRIL 21, 2018

- Thomas H. Howlett, Member of the Payee Notification Workgroup, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposal advocate for state legislation that would implement payee notification when a claim is paid with insurance funds. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed with an amendment to proposed state legislation to enact payee notification when a claim is paid with insurance funds, including self-insured municipalities and other insurers.
- Robert F. Gillett, Chair of the Consistent Fee Waiver Workgroup, addressed the Assembly for consideration of proposed amendments to MCR 2.002 that will allow indigent persons lacking the ability to pay filing fees to have those fees waived through a process that is expeditious, humane, efficient in terms of litigant and court system administrative time, and consistent in all Michigan courts and to provide for a statewide uniform standard for Michigan courts to determine indigency. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed with an amendment.
- Daniel D. Quick, Chair of the Civil Discovery Court Rule Review Special Committee, addressed the Assembly for consideration of proposed changes to the Michigan civil discovery rules to improve the civil discovery process by making it more cost effective; increasing access to courts; better enabling active, informed, and efficient judicial case management; and encouraging parties and lawyers to cooperate and act reasonably during the discovery process. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed with amendments.

SEPTEMBER 27, 2018

- Jennifer M. Grieco, President-Elect, and Richard L. Cunningham, Vice-Chair, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposal supporting the creation of a Task Force to examine whether changes in the structure, governance, and scope of operation of the State Bar of Michigan are advisable, and to make recommendations concerning specific changes. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed 97 to 4 with 3 abstentions.
- Nicholas M. Ohanesian, Chair of the Assembly Review Committee, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposal supporting an amendment to the Permanent Rules of Procedure of the Representative Assembly to permit virtual meetings and voting and further recommend to the Board of Commissioners conforming changes to the Bylaws of the State Bar of Michigan. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal to amend the Permanent Rules of Procedure passed 80 to 13 with amendments. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal to recommend amending the Bylaws passed 88 to 7.
- Daniel J. Ferris, Chair of the Drafting Committee, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposal supporting an amendment to the Permanent Rules of Procedure Section 7.4 regarding the Committee on Drafting. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed with amendment 94 to 1 with 1 abstention.

- Matthew R. Abel, Member of the Representative Assembly, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposal to support the ballot initiative for marijuana legalization. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal was determined not to be permissible under *Keller* with 85 members voting that the proposal was not *Keller*-permissible and 16 members voting that the proposal was *Keller*-permissible.
- Dawn M. King, Member of the Hearings Committee, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposal supporting an amendment to the Permanent Rules of Procedure Section 7.3 regarding the Committee on Outreach and Hearings. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed 88 to 2.
- Philip M. Moilanen, Member of the Rules & Calendar Committee, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposal supporting an amendment to the Permanent Rules of Procedure Section 4.6 regarding Written Resolutions. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed 93 to 1 with 1 abstention.

APRIL 13, 2019

- Michael H. Dettmer, Member of the Receivership Workgroup, addressed the Assembly for consideration of the Interim Administrator Proposal to protect clients in the event their attorneys become unexpectedly unable to practice law, recommending that the State Bar of Michigan (SBM) recommend rule changes to the Michigan Supreme Court to allow SBM to implement an Interim Administrator Program (IAP) to help lawyers prepare for end of practice events and to require attorneys in private practice to choose to either: 1) designate an Interim Administrator (IA) or 2) participate in the IAP. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed.
- Joshua A. Blanchard, Chair of the Criminal Law Section, addressed the Assembly for consideration of the proposed addition of MCR 8.128 providing a mechanism for members of the Bar to secure periods of leave for vacation or other purposes. Upon a motion made and supported to waive discussion, the proposal passed without further discussion.

SEPTEMBER 26, 2019

- Bernard A. Jocuns, member of the Assembly, and Joshua A. Blanchard, Chair of the Criminal Law Section, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposal supporting an amendment to MCR 6.005. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed 84 to 18.
- Mathew Kobliska, member of the Assembly, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposal supporting an amendment to MCR 3.206. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed 97 to 9.
- Edward H. Pappas, Past-President of the State Bar of Michigan, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposal supporting Professionalism Principles as provided to the Assembly in a handout. Upon a motion made and supported, after discussion, the proposal passed 94 to 14.

APRIL 25, 2020

- Sean Myers, Member of the Representative Assembly, and Bernard A. Jocuns addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to MCR 6.110(C) to mirror MCL 766.12 and set forth the protections for criminal defendants. After a discussion and vote, the Representative Assembly supported the proposed amendment:

Conduct of Examination. A verbatim record must be made of the preliminary examination. ~~Each party may subpoena witnesses.~~ The Court shall allow the prosecutor and the defendant to subpoena and call witnesses, offer proofs, and examine and cross-examine witnesses at the preliminary examination. The court must conduct the examination in accordance with the Michigan Rules of Evidence.

- Alena M. Clark, representing the Women Lawyers Association of Michigan, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to the Michigan Code of Judicial Conduct 2(F). After a discussion and vote, the Representative Assembly supported the proposed amendment with the additional comments provided in additional materials:

A judge should not allow activity as a member of an organization to cast doubt on the judge's ability to perform the function of the office in a manner consistent with the Michigan Code of Judicial Conduct, the laws of this state, and the Michigan and United States Constitutions. ~~A judge should be particularly cautious with regard to membership activities that discriminate, or appear to discriminate, on the basis of race, gender, or other protected personal characteristic.~~ A judge shall not hold membership in any organization that practices invidious discrimination on the basis of religion, race,

national origin, ethnicity, sex, gender identity, or sexual orientation. Nothing in this paragraph should be interpreted to diminish a judge's right to the free exercise of religion.

COMMENTS:

[1] A judge's public manifestation of approval of invidious discrimination on any basis gives rise to the appearance of impropriety and diminishes public confidence in the integrity and impartiality of the judiciary. A judge's membership in an organization that practices invidious discrimination creates the perception that the judge's impartiality is impaired.

[2] An organization is generally said to discriminate invidiously if it arbitrarily excludes from membership on the basis of race, sex, gender, religion, national origin, ethnicity, or sexual orientation persons who would otherwise be eligible for admission. Whether an organization practices invidious discrimination is a complex question to which judges should be attentive. The answer cannot be determined from a mere examination of an organization's current membership rolls, but rather, depends upon how the organization selects members, as well as other relevant factors, such as whether the organization is dedicated to the preservation of religious, ethnic, or cultural values of legitimate common interest to its members, or whether it is an intimate, purely private organization whose membership limitations could not constitutionally be prohibited.

[3] When a judge learns that an organization to which the judge belongs engages in invidious discrimination, the judge must resign immediately from the organization.

[4] A judge's membership in a religious organization as a lawful exercise of the freedom of religion is not a violation of this Rule.

[5] This Rule does not apply to national or state military service.

SEPTEMBER 17, 2020

- Chelsea M. Rebeck, Vice-Chair of the Assembly, and Lori Buiteweg, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to the MRPC 1.8. After discussion and a vote, the Assembly supported 85 to 19 with 2 abstentions the proposed amendment as listed below:

(e) A lawyer shall not provide financial assistance to a client in connection with pending or contemplated litigation, except that

a lawyer may advance court costs and expenses of litigation, the repayment of which shall ultimately be the responsibility of the client; ~~and~~

a lawyer representing an indigent client may pay court costs and expenses of litigation on behalf of the client; ~~and~~

(3) a lawyer representing an indigent client may provide modest gifts to the client for food, rent, transportation, medicine and other basic living expenses provided that the lawyer represents the indigent client pro bono, pro bono through a nonprofit legal services or public interest organization, or pro bono through a law school clinical or pro bono program. The legal services must be delivered at no fee to the indigent client and the lawyer:

(i) may not promise, assure or imply the availability of such gifts prior to retention or as an inducement to continue the client-lawyer relationship after retention;

(ii) may not seek or accept reimbursement from the client, a relative of the client or anyone affiliated with the client; and

(iii) may not publicize or advertise a willingness to provide such financial gifts to prospective clients.

Financial assistance provided under (3) may be provided even if the indigent client's representation is eligible for a fee under a fee-shifting statute.

Commentary of MRPC 1.8:

A lawyer representing an indigent client, pro bono through a nonprofit legal services or public interest organization, or pro bono through a law school clinical or pro bono program may give the client modest gifts. Gifts permitted under paragraph (e)(3) are

limited to modest contributions for food, rent, transportation, medicine and similar basic necessities of life. If the gift may have consequences for the client (including, but not limited to: eligibility for government benefits or social services or tax liability) the lawyer should consult with the client before providing the modest gift. The exception in paragraph (e) (3) is narrow. Modest gifts are allowed in specific circumstances where it is unlikely to create conflicts of interest or invite abuse. Paragraph (e)(3) prohibits the lawyer from (i) promising, assuring or implying the availability of financial assistance prior to retention or as an inducement to continue the client-lawyer relationship after retention; (ii) seeking or accepting reimbursement from the client, a relative of the client or anyone affiliated with the client; and (iii) publicizing or advertising a willingness to provide gifts to prospective clients beyond court costs and expenses of litigation in connection with contemplated or pending litigation or administrative proceedings. Financial assistance, including modest gifts pursuant to paragraph (e)(3), may be provided even if the representation is eligible for fees under a fee shifting statute. Paragraph (e)(3) does not permit lawyers to provide assistance in contemplated or pending litigation in which the lawyer may eventually recover a fee, such as contingent-fee personal injury cases or cases in which fees may be available under a contractual fee-shifting provision, even if the lawyer does not eventually receive a fee.

- Bernard A. Jocuns, Member of the Representative Assembly, made the motion to table the consideration of the proposed amendment to MCR 8.120 to the April 2021 Assembly meeting. The motion passed 94 to 8 with 4 abstentions.

APRIL 24, 2021

- Patrick D. Crandell, Member of the Assembly, and Peter V. Granata, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to MCR 4.201. After a discussion, the Assembly voted 41 in support, 82 in opposition, with 2 abstentions and the proposal failed.
- Sean M. Cowley and Kandra K. Robbins, Members of the Unauthorized Practice of Law Committee, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to MRPC 5.5. After a discussion, the Assembly voted 102 in support, 8 in opposition, with 6 abstentions to approve the proposal.
- Chelsea M. Rebeck, Chair of the Assembly, Joseph P. McGill, Treasurer of the State Bar, and Gerrow D. Mason, Clerk of the Assembly, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed licensing fees increase. After a discussion, the Assembly voted 100 in support, 21 in opposition, with 4 abstentions to approve the proposal.

SEPTEMBER 18, 2021

- Yolanda M. Bennett, chair of the Assembly Diversity Committee, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to the Permanent Rules of Procedure, making the Diversity Committee a permanent committee under Rule 7.8. After discussion and vote, the Assembly voted 96 to 11 with 4 abstentions to adopt the proposal.
- Bernard A. Jocuns, member of the Assembly, and Danielle S. Cadoret, member of the Bar, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to MCR 6.201 to include the discovery requirements in U.S. Supreme Court and Michigan Supreme Court precedent and provide the protections thereof to criminal defendants. After discussion and vote, the Assembly voted 27 to 77 with 11 abstentions to not support the proposal
- Bernard A. Jocuns, member of the Assembly, and Danielle S. Cadoret, member of the Bar, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to MCR 7.105 and MCR 7.205 to extend the tolling time for filing an interlocutory appeal until all decisions/orders being appealed have been received by the trial court. After discussion and vote, the Assembly voted 30 to 70 with 9 abstentions to not support the proposal.
- Bernard A. Jocuns, member of the Assembly, and Danielle S. Cadoret, member of the Bar, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to MCR 8.119(H) to grant access to court recordings to any person seeking access that has a special interest warranting access and/or receipt of the court record, including a party or representative of the party. After discussion and vote, the Assembly voted 86 to 22 with 6 abstentions to support the proposal.
- John W. Reiser, member of the Assembly, addressed the Assembly for consideration of adopting a resolution in support of a Michigan Legal Milestone for the John Sinclair case. After discussion and vote, the Assembly voted 58 to 51 with 6 abstentions to support the resolution.

APRIL 9, 2022

- Toi E. Dennis, member of the State Bar of Michigan Diversity & Inclusion Advisory Committee, and Ashley E. Lowe, member of the State Bar of Michigan Access to Justice Committee, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct 1.8 that would allow an attorney representing an indigent client to assist with needs that frustrate the client's access to the justice system, such as providing transportation to and from court sessions, meals needed during long court sessions, and clothing appropriate to appear in a court proceeding. After discussion and vote, the Assembly voted 101 to 13 with 2 abstentions to adopt the proposal.
- Alecia Chandler, State Bar of Michigan Professional Responsibility Programs Director, Mark A. Armitage, Executive Director of the Attorney Discipline Board, and Jennifer M. Bentley, Executive Director of the Michigan State Bar Foundation, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct 1.15 and 1.15A and accompanying commentary to clarify the requirements for attorneys managing client trust accounts. After discussion and vote, the Assembly voted 93 to 10 with 5 abstentions to support the proposal with amendment.

SEPTEMBER 17, 2022

- Patrick D. Crandell, Chair of the Assembly Review Committee; Nicole A. Evans, Chair of the Special Issues Committee; Mark W. Jane, Chair of the Nominating & Awards Committee; and Michael P. Hanrahan, Chair of Outreach & Hearings Committee addressed the Assembly regarding challenges and opportunities for the upcoming year.
- Nicholas M. Ohanesian addressed the Assembly for consideration of an inconsistent advocacy request from the Family Law Section. After discussion and vote, the Assembly voted 23 to 71 with 6 abstentions to not support the proposal.
- Ashley E. Lowe, chair of the Justice Initiatives Committee, and Jamie Hochman Herz, member of the Justice Initiatives Committee, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to Michigan Rule of Professional Conduct Rule 6.1 regarding pro bono standards. After discussion and vote, the Assembly voted 50 to 54 with 3 abstentions to not support the proposal.
- Lore A. Rogers, co-chair of the Access to Justice Policy Committee, and Elisa Gomez, member of the Civil Procedure & Courts Committee, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to Michigan Court Rules 8.120 to permit individuals barred (licensed) in other U.S. states to staff, under supervision by a member of the State Bar of Michigan, public and nonprofit defender offices, legal aid clinics, and civil legal aid services and programs, subject to certain requirements. After discussion and vote, the Assembly voted 69 to 36 with 2 abstentions to support the proposal.

APRIL 29, 2023

- Jennifer S. Bentley, Michigan State Bar Foundation Executive Director, presented on the Access to Justice Fund.
- Gregory P. Conyers, Diversity Development Program Director, presented on the Face of Justice Program.
- Mark W. Jane, member of the Nominating Committee and John W. Reiser, Chair of the Representative Assembly, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to Michigan Permanent Rules of Procedure 2.7. After discussion and voice vote, the proposal passed with amendments.
- Nicholas M. Ohanesian, Past Chair of the Representative Assembly; Mark W. Jane, member of the Nominating Committee; and John W. Reiser, Chair of the Representative Assembly, addressed the Assembly in a continued discussion of challenges and opportunities for the Representative Assembly.

SEPTEMBER 21, 2023

- Nicholas M. Ohanesian addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to Michigan Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan Rule 6, Section 6, Regarding the Continuation of Service. After discussion and vote, the Assembly voted 73 to 11 with 3 abstentions to support the proposal.
- Nicholas M. Ohanesian addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to Michigan Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan Rule 6, Section 4, and State Bar of Michigan Bylaws Article IV, Section 2 Regarding Petitions for Election. After discussion and vote, the Assembly voted 59 to 30 with 5 abstentions to support the proposal.
- Nicholas M. Ohanesian addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to Michigan Court Rules

Concerning the State Bar of Michigan Rule 6, Section 5 Regarding Terms. After discussion and vote, the Assembly voted 69 to 23 with 0 abstentions to support the proposal.

- Nicholas M. Ohanesian addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to Michigan Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan Rule 6, Section 4 Regarding the Election of Representatives. After discussion and vote, the Assembly voted 69 to 17 with 0 abstentions to support the proposal.
- Nicholas M. Ohanesian addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to Michigan Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan Rule 6, Sections 2 & 3, Regarding Redistricting. After discussion and vote, the Assembly voted 18 to 69 with 1 abstention to not support the proposal.

APRIL 20, 2024

- Hon. Terry Clark addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to Michigan Code of Judicial Conduct Canon 4. After discussion and vote, the proposal passed with amendments
- Daniel Quick, President of the State Bar of Michigan, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to Michigan Court Rule 2.110 and 2.501. After discussion and vote, the proposal passed.
- Dan Korobkin, Member of the Representative Assembly, addressed the Assembly for consideration of a proposed amendment to Michigan Court Rule 8.109. After discussion and vote, the proposal did not pass.

SEPTEMBER 19, 2024

- Danielle Hirsch, Managing Director of the Court Consulting Division at the National Center for State Courts, gave a presentation on Michigan's Legal Deserts.
- Hon. Melissa L. Pope, Chief Judge, Nottawaseppi Huron Band of the Potawatomi Tribal Court, gave a presentation on Michigan's Tribal Court.

INDEX

A

ABA Model Rules of Professional Conduct · 10, 14, 22

C

Code of Judicial Conduct · 3, 13, 65
 Code of Professional Responsibility · 2, 4, 5, 6, 8, 13, 14
 Collateral Consequences · 48
 Committee on Local Bar Associations · 3
 Committees
 • Bar Journal Advisory Committee · 4
 • Character & Fitness Committee · 61
 • Civil Procedure & Courts Committee · 31, 33, 34, 42, 43, 45, 46, 49, 53, 54, 56, 59, 60, 61, 62
 • Civil Procedure Committee · 26, 27
 • Committee on Advertising · 5, 7, 11, 12
 • Committee on Advertising, Certification and Specialization · 7, 11, 12
 • Committee on Arbitration and Alternate Methods of Dispute Resolution · 8
 • Committee on Assigned Counsel Standards · 27
 • Committee on Certification and Specialization · 6
 • Committee on Character and Fitness · 3
 • Committee on Communications · 10
 • Committee on Continuing Legal Education · 6
 • Committee on Criminal Jurisprudence · 3, 5
 • Committee on Delivery of Legal Services · 24, 26
 • Committee on Economics of Law Practice · 7, 12
 • Committee on Judicial Selection · 25
 • Committee on Professional and Judicial Ethics · 10, 12, 14, 19, 25, 31
 • Committee on Professional Ethics · 26
 • Committee on Scope and Correlation · 13
 • Committee on Specialization in Legal Practice · 3, 5
 • Criminal Jurisprudence & Practice Committee · 45
 • Criminal Jurisprudence Committee · 36
 • Justice Initiatives · 36, 37, 41, 44, 47, 57
 • Long-Range Planning Committee · 25
 • Professional Ethics Committee · 61, 62
 • Special Committee on Court Fees · 8
 • Special Committee on Public Interest Law · 8
 • Special Committee on Trial Advocacy Certification · 4
 • Special Committee on Victims of Crimes · 14
 • Unauthorized Practice of Law · 36

G

GCR 316.9 · 12

GCR 519 · 5
 GCR 785.14 · 10, 11
 GCR 821 · 9
 GCR 912 · 9
 GCR 928 · 9
 GCR 931 · 14
 GCR 932 · 14
 GCR 960.1 · 10

L

Legislation

- HB 4176 (1987) · 17
- HB 4534 (1987) · 16
- HB 4647 (1987) · 17
- HB 4666 (1987) · 16
- HB 4704 (1976) · 5, 6
- HB 4774 (1980) · 9
- HB 4788 through HB 4814 (1988) · 17
- HB 4838 (1982) · 13
- HB 5174 (1988) · 17
- HB 5285 (1982) · 12
- HB 5436 (1992) · 22
- HB 5453 (1992) · 22
- HB 5492 (1992) · 22
- HB 5644 (1992) · 22
- HB 6034 (1976) · 6
- HJR D (1984) · 15
- HJR S (2015) · 59
- SB 0187 (1982) · 12
- SB 0188 (1982) · 12
- SB 0273 (1987) · 16
- SB 0352 (1987) · 17
- SB 0460 (1992) · 21
- SB 0688 (1992) · 22
- SB 0689 (1992) · 22
- SB 0743 (2014) · 52
- SB 0816 (1984) · 14
- SB 2324 (1987) · 17
- SJR B (1984) · 15
- SJR J (2015) · 59

M

MCR 1.110 · 27
 MCR 2.002 · 63
 MCR 2.003 · 53
 MCR 2.107 · 27, 35, 36, 42, 53, 61
 MCR 2.112 · 32, 33
 MCR 2.116 · 32, 56, 62
 MCR 2.117 · 61
 MCR 2.119 · 56, 60, 62
 MCR 2.203 · 27, 52

MCR 2.301 · 41
 MCR 2.302 · 26, 41, 43, 49, 59
 MCR 2.305 · 26, 53
 MCR 2.306 · 51, 53
 MCR 2.308 · 51
 MCR 2.310 · 27
 MCR 2.311 · 50
 MCR 2.313 · 41
 MCR 2.317 · 26
 MCR 2.401 · 32, 41
 MCR 2.402 · 26, 36
 MCR 2.403 · 8, 33, 54
 MCR 2.405 · 23
 MCR 2.506 · 41, 53
 MCR 2.513 · 38, 39, 40, 41
 MCR 2.516 · 46
 MCR 2.519 · 41
 MCR 2.602 · 52, 53
 MCR 2.625 · 15, 26
 MCR 3.101 · 26
 MCR 3.201 · 37
 MCR 3.206 · 64
 MCR 3.222 · 37, 38
 MCR 3.602 · 34
 MCR 3.605 · 57
 MCR 3.606 · 57
 MCR 3.928 · 57
 MCR 3.944 · 57
 MCR 3.956 · 57
 MCR 4.201 · 67
 MCR 5.125 · 60
 MCR 5.972 · 27
 MCR 6.001 · 57, 58, 61
 MCR 6.005 · 64
 MCR 6.110 · 64
 MCR 6.201 · 44, 45, 67
 MCR 6.302 · 47
 MCR 6.425 · 44, 45, 57
 MCR 6.435 · 29
 MCR 6.445 · 57
 MCR 6.610 · 36, 45, 57
 MCR 6.933 · 57
 MCR 7.105 · 67
 MCR 7.109 · 54
 MCR 7.205 · 67
 MCR 7.215 · 16
 MCR 7.300 · 30
 MCR 7.301 · 49, 51
 MCR 7.305 · 27
 MCR 8.115 · 44, 45
 MCR 8.116 · 51
 MCR 8.119 · 59, 68
 MCR 8.120 · 33, 67
 MCR 8.128 · 64
 MCR 9.100 · 30
 MCR 9.109 · 24
 MCR 9.112 · 29
 MCR 9.115 · 26
 MCR 9.119 · 19
 MCR 9.125 · 24
 MCR 9.200 · 31
 MCR 9.205 · 20

MCR. 3.222 · 37
 Michigan Code of Judicial Canon

- 2(F) · 47

 Michigan Code of Judicial Conduct

- (7)(2) · 28
- 7(A)(2)(a) · 28
- 7(A)(4) · 28
- 7(B)(2)(a) · 28
- 7(B)(2)(c) · 28
- 8 · 27, 29
- MCJC · 20, 21, 23, 28, 29, 45, 47

 Michigan Rules of Professional Conduct

- MRPC · 20, 21, 30, 32, 33, 34

 MPRC 4.4 · 61
 MRPC 1.0 · 34, 61
 MRPC 1.10 · 19
 MRPC 1.15 · 34, 39
 MRPC 1.18 · 61
 MRPC 1.2 · 61, 62
 MRPC 1.4 · 34
 MRPC 1.5 · 34
 MRPC 1.8 · 18, 26, 66
 MRPC 1.9 · 19
 MRPC 3.8 · 20
 MRPC 4.2 · 25, 26, 34, 61
 MRPC 4.3 · 61
 MRPC 5.5 · 67
 MRPC 6.1 · 31, 37, 47
 MRPC 6.3 · 24, 26
 MRPC 7.1 · 26, 52, 62
 MRPC 7.2 · 17, 19, 52, 61
 MRPC 7.3 · 19, 61
 MRPC 8.2(a) · 29
 MRPC 8.3 · 21
 MRPC 8.4(b) · 62

P

Permanent Rules of Procedure · 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 17, 18, 29,
 30, 32, 37, 38, 55, 59, 63, 64, 67

R

RA Committees

- Assembly Review Committee · 7, 14, 15, 25, 27, 31, 32, 37, 51, 52, 54, 55, 63
- Committee on Hearings · 14
- Drafting Committee · 25, 28, 33, 48, 49, 52, 63
- Rules & Calendar Committee · 4, 5, 6, 8, 48, 49, 64
- Special Assembly Committee on Institute of Continuing Legal Education · 9
- Special Assembly Committee on Recognition of Local Bar Associations · 8
- Special Committee on the Profession · 25
- Special Hearing Committee · 25
- Special Issues Committee · 29, 31, 37, 38, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 52

S

Sections

- Alternative Dispute Resolution Section · 46, 47, 48
- Consumer Law Section · 48
- Criminal Law Section · 64
- Family Law Section · 4, 8, 18, 37, 38, 47, 48
- Labor and Employment Section · 26
- Law Student Section · 6
- Real Property Law Section · 38
- Senior Lawyers Section · 41

State Bar bylaws · 3

State Bar Grievance Board · 3, 4

Strategic Plan

- strategic plan · 32

Supreme Court Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan
· 2, 4, 5, 7, 10, 11, 14, 15, 18, 19, 20, 24, 27, 28,
29, 31