



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

June 18, 2009

**MICHIGAN COURT FORMS COMMITTEE**  
Minutes of June 2, 2009 Meeting

Present: Jerome Colwell, Barry/Eaton County Department of Human Services  
Hon. R. Terry Maltby, Sanilac County Probate Court  
Hon. Fred Mulhauser, Emmet/Charlevoix County Probate Court  
David C. Rauch, Court Administrator, Charlevoix County Probate Court  
Cynthia Sherburne, Attorney, 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit Court  
Karen Snyder, 37<sup>th</sup> Circuit Court  
Amy Byrd, State Court Administrative Office (staff)  
Jonie Mitts, State Court Administrative Office (staff)  
Jenifer Pettibone, State Court Administrative Office (staff)  
Jennifer Warner, State Court Administrative Office (staff)  
Starr Weiber, State Court Administrative Office (staff)  
Tammy Wenn, State Court Administrative Office (staff)

Absent: Hon. Judy Hartsfield, 3<sup>rd</sup> Circuit Court

---

Meeting called to order at 9:30 a.m. Introductions were made.

1. JC 11a, Order After Preliminary Hearing (Child Protective Proceedings)

Members reviewed the proposal to remove item 19 pursuant to 2008 PA 199. The committee agreed that the item regarding automatic suspension of parenting time when a petition to terminate parental rights is filed should be removed.

The committee also considered suggestions submitted by Oakland County during the public comment period and declined to make the changes to items, 24, 25, and 26. Members indicated that the order already addresses suspension of parenting time. The phrase “or until further order of the court” at the end of items 24, 25, and 26 makes it clear the suspension is not just for psychological evaluation or counseling.

Items on the form were renumbered appropriately, and the form was approved as revised.

2. JC 19, Order Following Dispositional Review/Permanency Planning Hearing (Child Protective Proceedings)

Members reviewed the proposals to add items 10, 15, 17, 18, 21, and 32 and to revise item 22 pursuant to 2008 PA 199 and MCR 3.979. The committee agreed with the changes and made additional changes for purposes of clarity.

Members discussed a request from Oakland County to add space after options 10a and 10b. SCAO staff indicated that space is already available at the end of the entire item, but that it is probably not understood this space is intended for both items 10a and 10b. Because space is limited and to avoid making the form a five-page form, a parenthetical statement, “(Explain the reasons for 10a or 10b in space below.)” was added to item 10 to make it clear that the current space is to be used for either option.

**Staff Note:** During typesetting, it was not possible to fit the parenthetical on one line. In order to preserve the amount of space available, the parenthetical was changed to: “(State reasons for a. or b. in the space below.)”

Members discussed comments from Tobin Miller of the Department of Human Services and Oakland County regarding the court rule cites in item 15 and agreed that reference to MCR 3.979(A)(3) was inappropriate on this form because parental rights have not yet been terminated at this point. The phrase “and (3)” was stricken from item 15.

Members discussed a request from Oakland County to provide space in item 15 for the court to indicate the best interest findings. The committee concluded that the findings did not need to be in writing. It is a local decision to put these in writing or leave them on the record. Therefore, the suggested change was not made.

The committee thought it would be helpful to make clear that item 17 pertains to the first review hearing after the appointment and suggested a parenthetical statement be added at the end of the item as follows: “(at the first review hearing after appointment).”

**Staff Note:** While it made sense during the discussion that took place in the meeting, during typesetting, it was not as clear as to the exact meaning of the parenthetical in item 17. To reduce the possibility of misunderstanding by users, it was changed to say “(This finding is considered at the first review hearing after the appointment).”

The Department of Human Services recommended that the second box in item 21 be made clearer because there is not lead-in statement. The committee was advised that originally, all of item 21 was part of 20, so this item would have read “The child(ren) is/are continued in the protective/temporary custody of this court, and . . . \_\_ placed under guardianship pursuant to MCR 3.979(B).” The committee agreed item 21 should remain part of item 20 instead of being a separate item 21. The numbering of the options was changed in order to make it clearer that they relate to the lead-in statement, including adding the parenthetical statement “(Check only one.)” Therefore, the options are a, b, c, and d.

Oakland County had recommended adding checkboxes in front of item a. and b. of 21. However, staff pointed out it was unnecessary. The criminal record check and home study must be ordered by the court unless they are already available. If they are available, the option “placed under guardianship” would be checked. The committee agreed and declined to make the change.

The committee considered Oakland County’s suggestion to place a caption under the date line in item 22. Members decided to omit the date line and use the current language, but replaced the 42 days with the 28 days not required under court rule.

The committee inquired about the authority for the 35 days time limit in item 32. After considering the rules, it was decided no limit should be mentioned because there is no specific time frame.

The entire form was renumbered as appropriate.

The form was approved as revised.

3. JC 63, Order Terminating Parental Rights (Child Protective Proceedings)

Members reviewed the proposed change with regard to best interests of the children, which implement the amendments in 2008 PA 199, and agreed with the change. The committee also discussed suggestions from judges who attended a recent judicial symposium to separate the two criteria in item 8 for terminating parental rights. Members agreed that the clear and convincing standard for termination should be separate from the best interests finding because both statute and rule are silent about the standard of proof for best interests.

While discussing these changes, the committee also decided that it wanted to increase the use of the form so that it can be used regardless of the conclusion of the termination hearing. Currently, the form can be used only when parental rights are terminated. Members agreed that most courts enter an order following a termination hearing where parental rights are not terminated and concluded that use of the form be expanded accordingly. Therefore, the title of the form was changed to “Order Following Hearing to Terminate Parental Rights (Child Protective Proceedings)” and the items in the order were converted to check box options.

Members discussed the practice of holding a permanency planning hearing within 28 days after termination. Since this is overlooked by many courts, and even though there is a note at the foot of the form, the committee determined that a parenthetical statement should be added to item 7c as follows: “(Requires a permanency planning hearing within 28 days.)” In addition, an option was added to old item 15 (now item 17) for entering the hearing date for the permanency planning hearing as follows: “17. A \_\_ review hearing \_\_ permanency planning hearing will be held \_\_\_\_\_.” Also, staff from Child Welfare Services pointed out that the note was incorrect and the phrase “unless a

permanency planning hearing was held before termination (form JC 19)” should be removed. The committee agreed and the change was made.

Old item 9 was moved to item 8 and the remainder of the form was revised as follows:

“9. There is clear and convincing evidence that a statutory basis exists for terminating the parental rights of \_\_\_\_\_, parent(s) of the child(ren).

10. Termination of parental rights \_\_\_ is \_\_\_ is not in the best interests of the child(ren).

IT IS ORDERED:

\_\_\_ 11. The parental rights of \_\_\_\_\_ are terminated, and additional efforts for reunification of the child(ren) with the parent(s) shall not be made.

\_\_\_ 12. \_\_\_ a. The child(ren) is/are continued . . .  
\_\_\_ b. The child(ren) is/are . . .

\_\_\_ 13. The Director of the Michigan Department of Human Services . . .

\_\_\_ 14. Other: (Include . . .)

\_\_\_ 15. The court reserves the right . . .

\_\_\_ 16. The supplemental petition to terminate the parental rights of \_\_\_\_\_ is denied.

17. A \_\_\_ review hearing \_\_\_ permanency planning hearing will be held \_\_\_\_\_.”

The form was approved as revised.

4. JC 75, Order Following Emergency Removal Hearing (Child Protective Proceedings)

The committee reviewed the proposed changes with regard to automatic suspension of parenting time when a petition to terminate parental rights is filed, which implements the amendments in 2008 PA 199. It agreed that item 15 should be removed accordingly. The remainder of the form was renumbered accordingly.

Members discussed the language in item 7 that was rewritten to better reflect the procedure for emergency removal. They agreed with the judges who attended a recent judicial symposium that neither this form, nor JC 05b, adequately address the postadjudication removal provisions in MCR 3.974(B). Rather than created a different “order to take/place” for use under MCR 3.974(B)(1) and (B)(2), members decided to amend JC 05b by

providing check box options in item 3a as follows: “3. \_\_\_ a. There are reasonable grounds for this court to remove the child(ren) from the parent(s), guardian, or legal custodian in compliance with \_\_\_ MCL 712A.2(b) and MCR 3.963(B) \_\_\_ MCR 3.974(B)(1) because conditions . . . .” JC 05b was approved as revised. The committee declined to renumber items 7a, 7b, and 7c to items 7, 8, and 9 as suggested in the comments received from Oakland County.

After making the changes to JC 05b, members pointed out that the court rule cite in item 7b of JC 75 should be changed from MCR 3.963(B) to MCR 3.974(B)(1).

Reference to MCR 3.979(F)(2) was added to the foot of the form.

The form was approved as revised.

5. JC 76, Order After Post-Termination Review/Permanency Planning Hearing (Child Protective Proceedings)

The committee reviewed the proposed changes with regard to appointment of a juvenile guardian when it is in the best interests of the children to do so, which implements amendments in 2008 PA 203, as well as the changes that incorporate the provisions in MCR 3.979 with regard to appointment, termination, and revocation of a juvenile guardianship. The committee also considered comments from Oakland County and the Department of Human Services.

Members pointed out a grammatical error in item 4 and removed the term “was.”

The committee agreed with Oakland County’s suggestion that the order of items 9a and 9b be switched to reflect the order of permanency plans set forth in statute.

Members agreed with the addition of items 10, 14, and 15 with a few minor revisions as follows. Item 10 was switched with item 13. Members remarked that the intent of item 14 should be clarified by adding a parenthetical statement “(at the first review hearing after the appointment.)” This statement will make it clear that this option is considered only at the first review hearing following the appointment of a juvenile guardian. A missing check box was added to the beginning of item 15 and another check box was added before the second sentence of item 15 and the “is/are” replaced with “was/were.”

**Staff Note:** During typesetting, the parenthetical statement in item 14 was replaced with the following language to make it clearer that the finding considered at the first review hearing: “(This finding is considered at the first review hearing after the appointment.)” Also, reference to “child(ren) was/were” in item 15 was changed to “child was” because there is only one child per guardianship case.

The committee did not place check boxes before items a, b, and c in item 16 as suggested by Oakland County. Although they are discreet actions, all three items are required.

The committee discussed the comment from the Department of Human Services commented that the form requires the consent of the MCI superintendent to be filed within 28 days, while the court rule permits the court to allow for a longer time when good cause is shown. Members did not think it necessary to change the form because the court wants the consent within 28 days and if the MCI superintendent needs more time, he will motion the court for hearing for that purpose. At that hearing, the court will determine whether there is good cause to extend the time.

Members discussed the options in item 16 and suggested that each option be numbered separately for clarity and so that the option regarding placement under juvenile guardianship is not preceded by the language committing the children to the Department of Human Services. The items were approved as follows:

\_\_ 16. The child(ren)'s commitment to the Department of Human Services for permanency planning, supervision, care, and placement under MCL 400.203 continues.

\_\_ 17. The child(ren)'s commitment to the Department of Human Services for permanency planning, supervision, care, and placement under MCL 400.203 continues, and the Department shall, for the child(ren) named in item 9a,  
a. conduct . . .  
b. perform . . .  
c. seek . . .”

\_\_ 18. The child(ren) shall be placed under juvenile guardianship pursuant to MCR 3.979(B). (See separate order, form JC 91).

The remainder of the form was renumbered accordingly.

The committee did not discuss Oakland County's suggestion to add language about terminating the rights of MCI in item 20 (now item 22), but it did correct the misspelling of the word “jurisdiction.”

Members recommended that the additional option in item 24 for the dispositional review hearing to terminate jurisdiction be moved before the sentence “The supervising agency shall provide documentation of progress relating to all aspects of the last court-ordered treatment plan, . . .”

The committee agreed to the addition of item 25.

The form was approved as revised.

6. JC 91, Order Appointing Juvenile Guardian

The committee reviewed the new form required by MCR 3.979(B). Because an order can only be entered for a single child, reference to “name(s)” in item 1 was changed to “name.”

The committee considered Oakland County's comment that a referee can hear all juvenile guardianship proceedings. After reviewing the court rule, the committee agreed and added reference to the referee in item 2 and added the standard reference signature line above the date and signature lines for the judge.

The committee agreed that reference to the NA case number should be included in item 3 and a line was added as follows: "3. On \_\_\_\_\_, in case number \_\_\_\_\_, the court determined it to be . . ."

The committee discussed option 4b and concluded that it did not always apply because there are situations where children are not committed to MCI at termination and there are situations where the court has found that MCI's decision to withhold consent was arbitrary or capricious. Therefore, item 4b was altered as follows: "\_\_ b. The parental rights over the child were terminated on \_\_\_\_\_ and the written consent of the Michigan Children's Institute superintendent to the juvenile guardianship \_\_ has been filed. \_\_ is not required pursuant to MCR 3.979(A)(3)(c). \_\_ is not required because the child(ren) were not committed to MCI."

**Staff Note:** Reference to "child(ren)" in item 4b should be changed to "child" because a separate order is entered for each child.

Members agreed with the Department of Human Services that MCR 3.979(E) should be used in item 8 instead of 3.979(B)(4) and (E), and reference to MCR 3.979(B)(4) was deleted.

The committee discussed Oakland County's suggestions that item 9 and 10 be on separate orders. After considerable discussion, the committee decided to remove items 9 and 10 and to include reference to child support and parenting-time provisions in "Other" as follows: "\_\_ 9. Other: (Include any provisions for parenting time or child support. When item 7 is checked, include a provision requiring the juvenile guardian to petition the probate court for a conservator.)"

**Staff Note:** During typesetting, the lines for the attorney name and address were removed. These came from the probate court form, which was used as a template when JC 91 was being drafted. This information is not necessary on this order.

7. JC 92, Acceptance of Appointment (Juvenile Guardian)

The committee reviewed the new form required by MCR 3.979(B)(1). Members agreed with the suggestion from the Department of Human Services that item 3 should be changed to "will not delegate my authority. . ." and made the change.

Reference to "name(s)" was changed to "name" in item 1.

The committee declined to add the notice of reporting duties on this form because it could

be misinterpreted that the guardian is agreeing only to perform those duties listed on the form.

The form was approved as revised.

8. JC 93, Letters of Juvenile Guardianship

The committee reviewed the new form required by MCR 3.979(B)(2) and corrected the typographical errors in item 3 pointed out by judges at a recent judicial symposium.

Reference to “name(s)” was changed to “name” in item 1.

The committee declined to add an expiration date as suggested by Oakland County.

The committee discussed Oakland County’s concern about the instruction to serve the report and file proof of service. Members concluded it is a local decision whether or not to create instructions about how to do this, and agreed that the information needed to be left on the form.

The committee discussed Oakland County’s question about details regarding the death of a minor. Members concluded that it is up to each court to determine what they require. It is sufficient on this form to advise the guardian only to notify the court of a child’s death. This includes decisions about the proper handling of a child’s property upon his/her death.

The form was approved as revised.

9. JC 94, Annual Report of Juvenile Guardian on Condition of Child

The committee reviewed the new form required by MCR 3.979(E)(1). Reference to “name(s)” was changed to “name” in item 1.

The committee discussed Oakland County’s questions about the filing date of the report and receipt of child support. Members indicated that the reporting period is already specified in item 2 and nothing more is needed. The date it is filed will be stamped on the document. As for receipt of child support, it is not relevant to the condition of the child and need not be reported to the court.

The form was approved as revised.

10. JC 95, Order Appointing Person to Investigate Juvenile Guardianship

The committee reviewed the new form developed pursuant to MCR 3.979(D)(2).

Reference to “name(s)” was changed to “name” in item 1.

The committee discussed Oakland County's suggestion to add the juvenile guardian's name to item 1. Members decided the juvenile guardian's name should be placed in item 2 instead.

The committee split item 2a into two options so that it is clearer there is a difference between terminating the appointment of a juvenile guardian and the revoking a juvenile guardianship. As currently written, it appears that the terms "terminate" and "revoke" are synonymous. Also, the committee agreed to Oakland County's suggestion to increase the space in item 2b for specifying the reasons for an investigation. The following was approved. "2. \_\_\_ a. A petition to terminate \_\_\_\_\_ has been filed. \_\_\_ b. A petition to revoke the juvenile guardianship has been filed. \_\_\_ c. The court deems an investigation to be appropriate because . . ."

**Staff Note:** To further clarify that termination applies to the appointment of a juvenile guardian, item 2a was replaced with the following language during typesetting: "2. \_\_\_ a. A petition to terminate the appointment of \_\_\_\_\_ has been filed." Reference to the appointment of the juvenile guardian was also added to the last option in item 3 as follows: "Pursuant to MCR 3.979(F)(3), the report shall include the reasons for terminating the appointment of a juvenile guardian or revoking a juvenile guardianship and a recommendation regarding temporary placement."

The committee declined to adopt the language suggested by Oakland County for item 4 with regard to service.

**Staff Note:** If necessary, a note can be added to JC 96 advising the person preparing the report that it is to be served on interested persons pursuant to MCR 3.979(D)(2).

Members agreed with the suggestion from the Department of Human Services to change the language in the second option of item 4 should to "7 days before the hearing" to comply with MCR 3.979(F)(3).

The standard reference signature line was added before the date and signature lines of the judge.

The form was approved as revised.

#### 11. JC 96, Report After Investigation of Juvenile Guardianship

The committee reviewed the new form developed pursuant to MCR 3.979(D)(2) and (F)(3).

Reference to "name(s)" was changed to "name" in item 1.

Members discussed the format of item 12 and the option for recommending a hearing. After reviewing the court rule, it was agreed that item 12 should be made into two options, both of which include an option for requesting that a hearing be scheduled. This will help

to eliminate some of the confusion about the interpretation of MCR 3.979(D)(3) with regard to a request for a hearing. It has been interpreted by some to mean that the court can modify the guardianship without a hearing if a hearing has not been requested. The following was approved: “12. I RECOMMEND that  
\_\_ a. this juvenile guardianship be continued without modification. \_\_ I request that a hearing be scheduled.  
\_\_ b. this juvenile guardianship be continued with the following modifications:  
\_\_\_\_\_. I request that a hearing be scheduled.”

The Use Note was changed to say “This report is used only for investigations ordered pursuant to MCR 3.979(D)(2).”

The form was approved as revised.

12. JC 97, Order Following Investigation and Report on Juvenile Guardianship

The committee reviewed the new form developed pursuant to MCR 3.979(D)(3).

Reference to “name(s)” was changed to “name” in item 1.

The committee discussed a suggestion from judges who attended a judicial symposium to add a new item 6 that allows for summary modification. Based on the discussion of JC 96 and the intent of MCR 3.979(D)(2) and (3), members concluded that a modification can be made only after a hearing. Therefore, no change was made.

Members considered a comment from Oakland County to add a line for the time of the hearing and the name of the jurist in item 6. The committee agreed to the addition as follows: “\_\_ 6. A hearing shall be conducted on \_\_\_\_\_  
at \_\_\_\_\_ before \_\_\_\_\_ to investigate the issues raised by the review.”

**Staff Note:** During typesetting, item 6 was rearranged as follows: “\_\_ 6. A hearing to investigate the issues raised by the review shall be conducted on \_\_\_\_\_  
at \_\_\_\_\_ before \_\_\_\_\_.”

The standard reference signature line was added before the date and signature lines of the judge.

The Use Note was changed as follows: “USE NOTE: This form is used only for an investigation that was ordered pursuant to MCR 3.979(D)(3).

The form was approved as revised.

13. JC 98, Petition to Terminate Juvenile Guardianship, Notice of Hearing, and Order  
JC 99, Petition to Revoke Juvenile Guardianship, Notice of Hearing, and Order

The committee reviewed the new form developed pursuant to MCR 3.979(F).

Members decided the petition to terminate should be separated from the petition to revoke to avoid the possibility that the terms “terminate” and “revoke” will be considered synonymous. The petition to terminate a juvenile guardian was numbered JC 98 and the petition to revoke the juvenile guardianship was numbered JC 99.

For the petition to terminate, the options for the lawyer-guardian ad litem and the DHS representative were removed in item 2, item 5 was deleted, and reference to “or revoked” was deleted from the Order portion. Because a referee can hold the hearing on the petition, reference to “Hon.” Was removed from the Notice of Hearing. Also, an “other” option was added to the Order portion in response to Oakland County’s comment that the court might want to direct DHS to investigate a successor guardian who has been named.

**Staff Note:** During typesetting, the title was changed to “Petition to Terminate Appointment of Juvenile Guardian, Notice of Hearing, and Order for Investigation,” and the standard reference signature line was added before the date and signature lines of the judge. Finally, the caption for the “Bar no.” in the Notice of Hearing was removed because the hearing can be held by a nonattorney referee.

For the petition to revoke, the options for the juvenile guardian and an interested person were removed in item 2, item 4 was deleted, and reference to “terminated” was deleted from the Order portion. Reference to the “minor” in item 5 was changed to “child.” Because a referee can hold the hearing on the petition, reference to “Hon.” Was removed from the Notice of Hearing. Also, an “other” option was added to the Order portion.

**Staff Note:** During typesetting, the title was changed to “Petition to Revoke Juvenile Guardianship, Notice of Hearing, and Order for Investigation,” and the standard reference signature line was added before the date and signature lines of the judge. The caption for the “Bar no.” in the Notice of Hearing was removed because the hearing can be held by a nonattorney referee. Also, the “other” option was removed from the Order portion, because it only applies to JC 98.

The forms JC 98 and JC 99 were approved as revised.

14. JC 100, Order Following Hearing on Petition to Terminate Juvenile Guardianship  
JC 101, Order Following Hearing on Petition to Revoke Juvenile Guardianship

The committee reviewed the new form developed pursuant to MCR 3.979(F).

Members decided the order to terminate should be separated from the order to revoke to avoid the possibility that the terms “terminate” and “revoke” will be considered

synonymous. The order on a petition to terminate a juvenile guardian was numbered JC 100 and the order on a petition to revoke the juvenile guardianship was numbered JC 101.

Reference to “name(s)” was changed to “name” in item 1.

The committee agreed with Oakland County’s suggestion to add reference to the referee in item 2, and also added the standard reference signature line before the date and signature lines of the judge.

The committee considered a suggestion from Oakland County to reword item 3 to permit waiver of notice of hearing by interested persons. Members remarked that there is no provision for this in the juvenile code or court rules and declined to make the change.

For the order on the petition to terminate, items 5 and 10 were deleted, and the second option in item 6 was removed.

The committee reviewed comments from judges who attended a judicial symposium. Primarily, the judges wanted to know whether an item for reasonable efforts findings should be added and if a prompt should be added in item 4 with regard to use of JC 05b and proceedings under MCR 3.974(B). Oakland County also suggested adding space for reasonable efforts findings. After some discussion, members concluded the language from JC 05b should be added to the order revoking the juvenile guardianship but that it was unnecessary to add reference to JC 05b in item 4 because JC 05b was revised to make clear when it is being used in a juvenile guardianship.

The judges also wanted clarification about the meaning of termination. The committee responded that the meaning of “termination” has been misconstrued because its meaning in the juvenile code is different than its meaning in EPIC. Although terminating a guardianship is essentially the same thing as revoking a guardianship under EPIC, under the juvenile code, termination is removing the juvenile guardian and appointment a successor. By splitting the two orders and preparing instructions for use of the forms, this will be made clearer.

The committee discussed a suggestion from Oakland County to add an option for the court to order the juvenile guardian discharged. Members agreed and the following was approved: “The juvenile guardian is terminated and \_\_ is \_\_ is not discharged. The current placement of the child shall continue pending appointment of \_\_\_\_\_ as successor guardian. . . .”

The committee did not agree with the suggestion from Oakland County to add an option in item 9 stating that the successor guardian shall be appointed by separate order because it is not necessary to order this. It’s simply the procedure to issue a separate order. **Staff Note:** It might be helpful to indicate on JC 91 that a particular juvenile guardian is a successor, but it’s not necessary because the order will be in the same file as the original juvenile guardian. The court is not opening a new case file because the decision about the need for

the guardianship was already determined in the NA case and the appointment of successor guardians takes place in the resulting JG case. Also, during typesetting, item 9 was changed as follows: “9. The appointment of the juvenile guardian is terminated . . .”

The committee did not agree with the suggestion from Oakland County to add an option in item 9 stating that the NA case is reopened, because the NA case is not reopened when the appointment of a juvenile guardian is being terminated and a successor appointed. If the appointment of a juvenile guardian is being terminated, but there is not successor to appoint, the petition to terminate is treated as a petition to revoke and JC 101 would be used instead. In that situation, the NA case would be reopened, and item 10 already accommodates this.

For the order on the petition to revoke, the first option in item 6 was removed and item 9 was deleted. Also, reference to the NA case number was added to item 10.

The committee discussed a request from Oakland County to add an item for discharging the juvenile guardian. Members agreed and the following was approved: “The \_\_\_\_\_ is not discharged.”

The committee did not agree with the request from Oakland County to add an option for “closing” the guardianship. These cases are not reported in the same manner as EPIC guardianships, nor do they require an order to close them. The revocation itself constitutes closure of the guardianship case. More important is discharging the juvenile guardian.

An item for “other” orders was also added.

Forms JC 100 and JC 101 were approved as revised.

**Staff Note:** Use notes were added to JC 100 and JC 101 to make clear when they are used. JC 100 is used in conjunction with JC 98 only when there is a proposed successor guardian named in the petition. If a successor guardian has not been named, JC 101 is to be used. Likewise, the use note on JC 101 says the form is always used in conjunction with JC 99 and is also used in conjunction with JC 98 when there is no proposed successor guardian.

#### 15. Other Forms

The committee considered a request from the Department of Human Services to develop a consent form for the MCI superintendent. The committee declined, indicating that it did not know what the MCI superintendent would want in the consent and that it was more appropriately a DHS form.

The committee considered a request from Oakland County to develop an order of discharge. The committee agreed that one should be developed for consideration at the meeting in the fall.

Minutes of June 2, 2009 Michigan Court Forms Committee Meeting  
June 18, 2009  
Page 14

Respectfully submitted,

Amy L. Byrd

cc: Steve Capps  
Anne Boomer  
Sally LaCross  
Regional Offices