



Michigan Supreme Court
State Court Administrative Office
Trial Court Services Division
Michigan Hall of Justice
P.O. Box 30048
Lansing, MI 48909

March 3, 2010

TO: Michigan Court Forms Committee (Friend of the Court representatives only)

FROM: Traci Gentilozzi, Forms and Manuals Analyst

RE: Agenda and Materials for **March 19, 2010 Meeting**

PLACE: **Michigan Hall of Justice**, 925 West Ottawa, downtown Lansing (map enclosed)

Below is the agenda for the March 19, 2010 meeting of the Friend of the Court Section of the Michigan Court Forms Committee (please again note the date change). The meeting starts at 9:30 a.m. and ends at 3:30 p.m. **Luncheon reservations have been made for you; if you cannot attend, please contact me at least two days before the meeting.** Please note that our office is located at 925 West Ottawa. A map and directions are provided.

Although documentation is provided with the agenda, it would be helpful to bring a copy of the Michigan Court Rules and any other resources you believe are necessary.

Note: New Laws, Friend of the Court Act and Support and Parenting Time Enforcement Act

Legislation amending the Friend of the Court Act and the Support and Parenting Time Enforcement Act took immediate effect in December 2009 and January 2010. See Public Acts 193, 194, and 233-239.

An initial review of the laws indicates a need to amend existing forms FOC 6, FOC 10, FOC 10a, FOC 10b, FOC 10c, FOC 12, FOC 13, FOC 13a, FOC 57, FOC 58, FOC 67, FOC 71, FOC 80, FOC 81, FOC 82, FOC 83, FOC 84, FOC 85, FOC 86, FOC 89, FOC 102, FOC 104, FOC 108, and FOC 109 and to develop new forms, some of which are (1) "notice" to Secretary of State regarding license suspension, (2) motion, response, and order regarding change in domicile, including instructions (form is already on the agenda as a tabled item from 2009 – see item 20), and (3) response and order regarding payment plan, including instructions for FOC 109. In addition, the SCAO will be identifying all existing and new "notice" forms for compliance with MCL 552.603(9) in regard to service by first-class mail.

Some of these forms are included in this agenda for discussion by the committee at its March 2010 meeting. After the SCAO conducts a more thorough review of the new laws, a special meeting of the Michigan Court Forms Committee will be convened later this year to review and develop any remaining forms identified by the SCAO. These forms will be published for a 30-day comment period pursuant to the standard process for revising and developing SCAO-approved court forms before they are presented to the committee.

1. FOC 2, Motion and Order to Show Cause for Contempt (Support)

- a. A deputy friend of the court has suggested this form be revised to inform parties that the court may consider modification of support at a show-cause hearing for nonpayment of support. The following language has been proposed: “The issue of appropriateness of the level of support and the possible modification of support may be considered at this hearing” and “It is important that the recipient of support attend this hearing.” The SCAO believes this language is inappropriate because a court will not have adequate time to thoroughly review the motion and make such a determination at a show-cause hearing. Should language of this sort be included for the benefit of the parties? A draft is provided.
- b. The citation to MCL 552.625(a) should be changed to MCL 552.625a.

See comment made during publication.

2. FOC 6, Enforcement Order

This form needs to be reviewed for compliance with various new Friend of the Court Act provisions.

(1) New surcharge option under MCL 552.603(6)(a). Even though FOC 6 is an enforcement order and not a support order, the surcharge option could be applicable at a show-cause hearing.

(2) New provisions for jail alternatives, including:

- vehicle booting under MCL 552.631(g).
- friend of the court supervision under MCL 552.635(2)(e).
- alternative detention under the support provisions in MCL 552.633(4)(a) and (b), and MCL 552.635(2)(a).

3. FOC 10, Uniform Child Support Order

FOC 10a, Uniform Child Support Order, No Friend of Court Services

FOC 10b, Uniform Spousal Support Order

FOC 10c, Uniform Spousal Support Order, No Friend of Court Services

- a. These forms must be reviewed and revised due to new provisions in the Friend of the Court Act.

(1) FOC 10

- Revise to reflect new optional surcharge under MCL 552.603(6)(a) (domestic relations support order) and MCL 552.603a.
- Revise to reflect MCL 552.603(7), which requires the disclosure of certain information, including a single mailing address for notice, residential address, phone number, statement regarding licenses held, etc.
- Revise to reflect MCL 552.603(8), which requires the friend of the court be notified of information changes and gives the friend of the court the ability to assess a fee for failure to disclose.
- Revise item 1 to reflect MCL 552.605b(3), which provides that support terminates on a date certain regardless of the actual graduation date.
- Revise item 9 to reflect MCL 552.605d(1)(b) and (3) and the redirection of support when a child is in county foster care.

(2) FOC 10a

- Revise to reflect new optional surcharge under MCL 552.603(6)(a) (domestic relations support order) and MCL 552.603a.
- Revise item 1 to reflect MCL 552.605b(3), which provides that support terminates on a date certain regardless of the actual graduation date.
- Revise item 9 to reflect MCL 552.605d(1)(b) and (3) and the redirection of support when a child is in county foster care.

(3) FOC 10b

- Revise to reflect new optional surcharge under MCL 552.603(6)(a) (domestic relations support order).
- Revise to reflect MCL 552.603(7), which requires the disclosure of certain information, including a single mailing address for notice, residential address, phone number, statement regarding licenses held, etc.
- Revise to reflect MCL 552.603(8), which requires the friend of the court be notified of information changes and gives the friend of the court the ability to assess a fee for failure to disclose.

(4) FOC 10c

- Revise to reflect new optional surcharge under MCL 552.603(6)(a) (domestic relations support order).

- b. A friend of the court office has suggested the following language be added at the end of item 3: “ The support charge was reduced because of a reduction in the payer’s income.” It has been asserted that, if the box is checked, the arrearage payment is calculated under §4.02(B)(8) of the *Michigan Child Support Formula Manual*. If the box is not checked, the arrearage payment is calculated under §4.02(B)(6)-(8). The SCAO notes this may not be practical because the calculation would have been made and determined before this point.
- c. A friend of the court employee has requested that space be included for the friend

of the court to sign and date the form. It has been asserted that some courts require the friend of the court's preapproval of orders in domestic relations cases and that these courts are currently adding their own handwritten signature and date lines, which is "unprofessional." The committee should note that reference is made to the possibility of preapproval on FOC 52 (instructions), which says, "In some courts the order has to be approved by the friend of the court before the judge will sign it." In addition, MCR 3.211(G) provides that "for all judgments and orders containing provisions identified in subrules (C), (D), (E), and (F), the court may require that the judgment or order be submitted to the friend of the court for review." The SCAO does not believe that a signature and date line should be added because the court rules and statutes do not require the friend of the court's signature on the form.

- d. A court employee has suggested that " If you disagree with this recommendation ..." in the second checkbox be capitalized or somehow set off so it is easier to recognize. It has been asserted that parties often overlook this statement.
- e. A friend of the court has requested that persons completing the form be able to designate whether the plaintiff and the defendant in items 4 and 5 are the "mother" or "father." It has been asserted that including "mother" and "father" after "plaintiff" and "defendant" will allow easier identification of the parties. Should this option be added? Or does the current form adequately identify the parties?

Drafts are provided. See comments received during publication.

4. Notice of Income Withholding

Pursuant to new provisions in the Friend of the Court Act, MCL 552.609(1), labor organizations must now send withholding notices to employers. It has been suggested that perhaps a form be developed to comply with the new requirements. The SCAO does not believe a statewide form should be developed for this purpose because a federal form already exists and labor organizations simply have an obligation to forward the federal form to the appropriate entity. It has been proposed that a document similar to FOC 11, Notice of Income Withholding, be developed. FOC 11 was deleted several years ago and served as a special "cover letter" or "notice." The SCAO believes this would suffice as the proper means of notification, rather than creating a new form. The federal income withholding form is provided.

5. FOC 12, Order

- a. This form should be revised to comply with changes to the Friend of the Court Act, specifically MCL 552.505(1)(g) and new provisions that require findings of proper cause or changes in circumstances before ordering a custody/parenting-time investigation. It has been asserted that, if the new requirements are not

clearly set forth on the form, then courts may not make findings at all or may make them on the record (and the friend of the court may not have access to them).

b. The SCAO has raised other issues regarding this form.

(1) It is recommended this form should simply be a referral order with an option of denying a motion. If the form is modified, should the title of the form also be changed?

(2) Orders for custody/parenting time and change of domicile already exist but are mentioned on this form in items 4, 5, and 6. Is this redundant? Should these references be removed? Should options be added for situations warranting a temporary order that references the order for support, custody/parenting time, etc.?

(3) Statutory cites should be added for all referrals, including MCL 552.505(1)(g) and (h), MCL 552.513, MCL 552.517(1)(c), and MCL 552.642a.

(4) Should a referral for a support review be added? The court can order both. An investigation for support under MCL 552.505 can be prejudgment or postjudgment and results in a friend of the court recommendation to the parties and the court. Postjudgment reviews under MCL 552.517 result in a friend of the court recommendation that gets submitted to the court for entry as an order, if no one objects.

(5) Should language be added that orders the parties to cooperate with the friend of the court and to provide the information requested by the office? This may be beneficial because sometimes parties are reluctant to cooperate.

(6) Should more details be provided regarding an order for mediation under MCR 3.216? Differences exist between friend of the court mediation and domestic relations mediation, including statutory differences under MCL 552.513, and it may be helpful to state this on the form. Also, can MC 274, Order for Mediation, be used and the citation to MCL 552.513 be added to that form?

A draft is provided.

6. FOC 19, Motion and Order to Show Cause for Contempt (Custody/Parenting Time)

This form should be revised for compliance with MCL 552.644(2)(f) and (i) regarding alternatives to jail and friend of the court supervision.

7. FOC 30, Notice of Registration of Out-of-State Support Order (UIFSA)

- a. A friend of the court office has suggested that a notice of fee provision be included on this form for due process reasons. It has been asserted the form needs to include a notice advising the payer that statutory processing fees will be assessed because the friend of the court is required to provide notice of this fee to the person ordered to pay support pursuant to MCL 600.2538(1). The following checkbox option has been proposed: “ The payer of support must pay fees as required by MCL 600.2538.” Rather than citing the specific statute, perhaps the language could say: “ The payer of support must pay fees as required by law.” The statute provides that “every person required to make payments of support or maintenance to be collected by the friend of the court or the state disbursement unit shall pay a fee of \$3.50 per month for every month or portion of a month that support or maintenance is required to be paid.” This language should be optional, however, for those situations where the payer in another state will continue paying through that state but the payer is petitioning for registration and modification in Michigan. The committee should note that a similar provision is already on FOC 10 generally (item 10).
- b. A suggestion has been made to add “as of _____” to item 4 because
Date
arrearage amounts are documented and calculated through a specified date, which should be clearly stated on the form. It has been explained that other states send their notices to Michigan, which relies on the other state’s documentation for calculation, and it would be beneficial to have a specific date on the form.
- c. It has been asserted that, pursuant to MCL 552.1603 and MCL 552.1621, the future verb tense (e.g., “will”) is inaccurate in item 6 because registration has immediate effect. It has been proposed the language be changed to: “The attached order is an ORDER OF THIS COURT, immediately enforceable as if the order was issued in this state.” The statutes are provided for reference.
- d. It has been asserted that the phrase “and you will not be permitted any further opportunity to challenge it” should be removed from item 6 because language of this sort is more appropriate in item 7. The following language is suggested pursuant to MCL 552.1621(2)(c): “Failing to properly petition the court will result in automatic confirmation of the registered order and amounts owed, and precludes you from contesting any matter that you could have asserted at registration.”
- e. It has been suggested that item 7 be changed to: “... 20 days from the date this notice was mailed or served on you” (new language underlined) because MCL 552.1623 sets the time to contest registration by requesting a hearing “within 20 days after the date of mailing or personal service of notice of the registration” and because “served” includes both mail and personal service. However, to distinguish between the types of service and to make the form less confusing, it

may be more appropriate to say: "... 20 days from the date of service of this notice by mail or personal delivery" (new language underlined). It has been asserted this language should be revised because persons using this form may not understand the concepts of service, including personal service and service by first-class mail, even though these terms are already on the proof of service section of the form.

- f. An option for first-class mail pursuant to MCR 3.203 should replace the current options for registered and certified mail on the proof of service.
- g. It is asserted that, in item 9, the phrase "At the hearing on the petition you may ..." is not specific enough because sometimes registration notices include a uniform support petition requesting modification along with registration. It has been suggested that the language be changed to: "At the hearing on the petition to contest the validity or enforcement of this registered order, you may present only matters available as a defense in an action to enforce a foreign money judgment" (new language underlined).
- h. It has been pointed out that this form may not comply with due process requirements because it does not state that, pursuant to state law, payments must be made through the Michigan State Disbursement Unit (MiSDU) or friend of the court. Rather, this language is on the order, FOC 30a, which says: "All payments shall be paid through the friend of the court or the Michigan State Disbursement Unit." However, it is asserted that having this language on the order may not satisfy due process because the order is issued after FOC 30. MCL 552.509 provides that, after a support order is entered in a friend of the court case, subject to the subsections transitioning payments to MiSDU, the office "shall receive each payment and service fee under the support order" Should this provision be added to the form?
- i. Last year, the Circuit and District Section of the Michigan Court Forms Committee adopted a new standard proof of service fee box that includes more detailed information. This fee box is being applied to all court forms with a proof of service, as those forms come up for review on other issues. Accordingly, the standard proof of service box will be applied to FOC 30.

A draft is provided.

8. FOC 30a, Order Vacating/Confirming Registration of Out-of-State Support Order (UIFSA)

- a. A question has been raised regarding distribution of FOC 30a and what entities should receive copies. MCL 552.1308(2) includes orders that specify the manner of payment and subsection (5) says that copies of orders go to the parties and initiating tribunal, if any. It has been asserted that copies must be sent to (1) the

initiating tribunal and (2) any prior registering tribunal(s) pursuant to MCL 552.1231 and MCL 552.1639. It has been explained that, in some circumstances, there is an initiating state agency, and not a tribunal. Because the confirmation order contains information that is different from prior orders (payment location, etc.), should copies of FOC 30a be sent to issuing tribunals and other tribunals that have registered the order?

- b. The following statement is in item 6.b: "This registered order cannot be contested." MCL 552.1625(3) says, "Whether by operation of law or after notice and hearing, a registered order's confirmation precludes further contest of the order with respect to a matter that could have been asserted at the time of registration." The language should be modified to make clearer that the preclusion is only in respect to matters that could have been asserted at the time of registration.

9. FOC 56, Referee Findings and Recommendation for Order after Hearing on Bench Warrant/Show Cause (Support)

- a. In 2008 the committee agreed this form should be revised to conform to the appropriate standards regarding (1) the address and telephone number of the court or friend of the court and (2) the captions in the parties' entitlement boxes. See the attached meeting minutes. However, approval and distribution of the form was put on hold because, after the meeting, the SCAO questioned whether substantive changes might be necessary regarding "service" of a bench warrant. The SCAO has questioned whether it is necessary to have findings on the form regarding "service" of a bench warrant. The SCAO has also inquired as to what types of "findings" referees routinely make.
- b. It has been asserted that item 7 needs revised to better reflect the language of the contempt statutes, MCL 552.631, MCL 552.633, and MCL 552.635. The SCAO believes the current form is accurate.
- c. It has been suggested that item 13 either be deleted or placed elsewhere on the form because it is improperly in the "findings" section of the form. It is asserted that item 13 is not a "finding" and is, instead, a "recommendation" or an "order."

A draft is provided.

10. FOC 57, Referee Findings and Recommendation for Order after Hearing on Alleged Custody/Parenting Time Violation

- a. In 2008 the committee agreed this form should be revised to conform to the appropriate standards regarding (1) the address and telephone number of the court or friend of the court and (2) the captions in the parties' entitlement boxes. See the attached meeting minutes. A draft is provided.

11. FOC 58, Order after Hearing on Alleged Custody/Parenting Time Violation

This form should be revised to comply with new Support and Parenting Time Enforcement provisions that (1) establish alternatives to jail, MCL 552.644(2)(e)-(f), and (2) allow for friend of the court supervision, MCL 552.644(2)(i). Specifically, it has been proposed that item 13 be modified to allow for something other than jail time. It has been suggested the language on the form be similar to the language on FOC 6. A draft is provided.

12. FOC 68, Objection to Referee's Recommended Order

It has been suggested that the instructions for this form be changed because they do not comply with the court rule. MCR 3.215(E) provides that the order becomes effective 21 days after the order is served. But the instructions for this form indicate that the objecting party must file the objection within 21 days after receiving the copy of the recommended order. MCR 3.203(A)(2) indicates that service may be made as provided in MCR 2.107, and MCR 2.107(C)(3) defines service as being complete at the time of mailing. The language on the form boils down to the proper definition of "service" – is it the day of mailing or the day of receipt?

13. FOC 70, Determination on Arrearage

Last year the committee questioned whether this form should be deleted or retained, and if retained, whether a certificate of mailing should be added because the form serves as a "notice." The committee tabled the items and the SCAO agreed to research the issues for further discussion in 2010. See the attached meeting minutes. The SCAO has determined that the form still has legitimate uses and should be retained. If the form is retained, the SCAO believes a standard certificate of mailing should be added.

14. FOC 80, Notice of Proposed License Suspension and Request for Hearing
FOC 81, Motion to Suspend License
FOC 82, Order Regarding Payment of Arrearage (License Suspension)
FOC 83, Notice Following Order for Payment of Arrearage (License Suspension)
FOC 84, Order Suspending License
FOC 85, Motion to Rescind License Suspension
FOC 86, Order Rescinding License Suspension (Child Support/Parenting Time)

These forms need to be reviewed and modified due to recent changes in the Friend of the Court Act and the Support and Parenting Time Enforcement Act that mandate a new license suspension policy. See MCL 552.628, MCL 552.629, MCL 552.630, MCL 552.631(1)(c), MCL 552.645(2)(b), and MCL 257.321c.

- a. Because FOC 80 serves as a notice of proposed license suspension, it has been suggested that FOC 80 be revised now and that FOC 81, FOC 82, FOC 83, FOC 84, FOC 85, and FOC 86 perhaps be modified at a later date because they are

used after FOC 80. It has also been suggested that maybe separate forms should be created for use under MCL 552.629(4), MCL 552.630(2), and MCL 552.645(2). The SCAO notes that, at this time, uncertainty remains as to whether separate forms are even necessary and the issue is currently being discussed with the Secretary of State.

- b. Pursuant to the new laws, a notice must be developed to inform the Secretary of State of the license suspension and a certificate must be developed to show compliance with a support order after entry of an order under MCL 552.630(2) or MCL 552.645(2). It has been proposed that this notice be developed in conjunction with the Secretary of State.

A draft is provided. See also comments received during publication.

15. FOC 90a, Notice of Lien Based on Registered Order (new form)

- a. It has been pointed out that FOC 90, Notice of Lien, only accommodates Michigan-issued orders and not other states' orders. Accordingly, it has been asserted that a new form should be designed specifically for liens based on registered orders, pursuant to MCL 552.1603 and MCL 552.625a. To accomplish this, it has been suggested the first sentence of FOC 90 be changed to say: "This lien results from a support order registered on _____ by the _____
Date _____ Circuit Court, _____ County, Michigan. This order requires the obligor named above to pay support in the amount of \$ _____ per _____."

Alternative proposed language is: "This lien results from a support order entered on _____ by _____ in _____."
Date _____ Tribunal name _____ Tribunal city and state _____"

- b. It has been suggested that the next sentence should be the following checkbox option: " This order requires the obligor named above to pay support in the amount of \$ _____ per _____."
- c. It has been proposed that the next sentence say: "As of _____ the obligor owes unpaid support in the amount of \$ _____ and this lien amount is subject to an interest rate of _____%." This would accommodate the interest rates, which vary by state.

16. FOC 95, Findings and Report on Arrearage Payment Amount

Last year the committee considered whether this form should be deleted. See the attached meeting minutes. The SCAO has researched the background on the development of the form and its continued need. The form was created in 1999 because it was determined that FOC 11, which has been deleted, was not the proper form to use. Also, the form was

developed for use in administrative hearings pursuant to MCL 552.517e. The SCAO believes legitimate uses for the form remain, primarily administrative matters under MCL 552.517e. Should the form be deleted?

17. FOC 109, Motion Regarding Payment Plan/Discharge of Arrears (with instructions)
FOC 117, Response to Motion Regarding Payment Plan/Discharge of Arrears (new form with instructions)
FOC 110, Order Regarding Payment Plan/Discharge of Arrears (new form with instructions)

FOC 109 should be revised due to new laws mandating that forms must be provided for payment plans. See MCL 552.505(1)(d) and MCL 552.519(3)(k)(i). In addition, the new laws require that a response, order, and instructions be developed. Drafts are provided.

18. FOC 103, Notice of Closure of Friend of the Court Case

This form was changed internally by the SCAO in 2009 and “Court” was removed from the distribution list because the form is not filed with the court. By doing this, the social security number was also removed from the court file, thereby helping to alleviate identity theft concerns. However, item 2 says, “Attached is a copy of a court order in this matter” The SCAO believes it is unnecessary to provide a copy of the order terminating the friend of the court’s involvement and would like this statement revised to say, “As a result of a court order in this matter terminating the friend of the court’s involvement in this case, you should take the action checked below:” A draft is provided. Upon further review of the form, the SCAO has questioned whether the form is even necessary because there is no statutory requirement to send a notice to the employer. Therefore, the SCAO has questioned how often the form is used. A draft is provided.

19. FOC 108, Change in Personal Information

This form should be reviewed for compliance with MCL 552.603(8) and MCR 3.203(F). Specifically, it has been asserted that items 1 and 2 need to be revised to comply with the new statutory requirements regarding “single mailing address,” etc.

20. FOC 115, Motion Regarding Change of Domicile/Legal Residence (new form with instructions)
FOC 116, Response to Motion Regarding Change of Domicile/Legal Residence (new form with instructions)
FOC 29, Order Regarding Change of Domicile/Legal Residence (with instructions)

In 2009 the committee approved the development of a motion to change domicile form and the SCAO agreed to draft a form for the committee’s review in 2010. In the meantime, the Friend of the Court Act was amended and MCL 552.505 now requires forms for motions regarding change of domicile, a response, an order, and instructions. An SCAO-approved order, FOC 29, already exists but needs to be revised to comply with

the new law. Drafts are provided.

21. FOC 112, Order to Remit Prisoner Funds for Child Support

It has been requested that item 2 be changed to say: “If the amount withheld at any one time is \$10.00 or less, the Department of Corrections shall continue collecting funds from the prisoner’s account ...” (new language underlined). It has been asserted this change should be made because a prisoner is not always the defendant in a domestic relations matter. See also attached SCAO Administrative Memorandum 2006-05 and FAQ 2007-02.

22. CC 388, Notice of Registration of Out-of-State Child-Custody Determination (UCCJEA)

A court has suggested that MCR 3.214(D) be included at the bottom of this form so the court knows not to charge a filing fee. Pursuant to MCL 722.1304(1), a child-custody determination issued by a court in another state may be registered in Michigan, and MCR 3.214(D) provides there is no fee for registering a child-custody determination in Michigan. Should the court rule cite be added to the form?

23. New Form, Prisoner Information Addendum

This new form has been proposed as a result of a pilot project regarding prisoner forms. This is a special form for looking at a prisoner’s ability to pay support and is basically a prisoner’s version of the income portion of FOC 39, Friend of the Court Case Questionnaire. Case law provides that a court must look at a prisoner’s ability to pay when ordering support. A draft is provided.

24. FOC 61, Objection to Ex Parte Order and Motion to Rescind or Modify
FOC 62, Order Modifying Ex Parte Order

These forms have instructions. While the forms have been revised in recent years, the instructions have not and, therefore, should be reviewed for accuracy.

25. FOC 47, Motion to Release Lien

The word “petition” in the notice of hearing and in the certificate of mailing should be changed to “motion” to reflect the title of the form.

26. FOC 111, Order Discharging Arrears

The statutory citation in item 2 needs to be corrected. The statute is MCL 552.605e and not MCL 550.605e.

27. New Form(s), Instructions for Filing Pro Per Motion to Show Cause

A friend of the court employee has indicated there has been a significant increase in pro per motions to show cause for support and parenting time and that petitioners are currently following instructions for filing motions to change support and parenting time. However, these instructions do not apply to motions for show cause because service must be made by personal delivery pursuant to MCR 2.107(B)(1)(b). It has been asserted that separate order to show cause packets with their own instructions be developed to remedy this problem, or perhaps just separate instructions be developed.

SCAO policy is to develop pro se packets and forms only when mandated by statute. The SCAO notes there is no mandate in MCL 552.631 to create pro se forms for show-cause proceeding and, if a party is initiating show cause instead of the FOC pursuant to MCL 552.631 and MCR 3.208, then the party proceeds by way of MCL 552.631 and MCR 3.606. Should a packet or instructions be developed even though not mandated by statute? No drafts have been provided.

Attachments

cc: Steve Capps
Anne Boomer
Sally LaCross
Amy Byrd
Jim Inloes
Bill Bartels