STATE OF MICHIGAN **JUDICIAL DISTRICT JUDICIAL CIRCUIT**

CERTIFICATION TO DEPARTMENT OF STATE (INTERLOCK PROGRAM)

CASE NO. and JUDGE

COUNTY	Part '	1		
Court address				Court telephone no
THE PEOPLE OF		Defendant's nam	e, address, and tele	phone no.
☐ The State of Michigan				
	v	Driver's License	No.	DOB
		CTN/TCN		SID
TO: Department of State				
 1. The defendant has been admitted into a special device has been installed in each motor vehicle MCL 257.625k and MCL 257.625l. 				
☐ 2. Travel ☐ is ☐ is not allowed under	MCL 257.3	304(4)(b)(xi).		
\square 3. The defendant has successfully completed a sp	pecialty co	urt program.		
4. Under MCL 600.1084(6), the Secretary of State	e is informe	ed that:		
a. the court ordered that the defendant be resuccessfully completed it.	emoved fro	m a specialty o	court program be	efore he or she
☐ b. the court became aware that the defendant device.	nt operate	d a motor vehic	cle that was not	equipped with an interlock
\square c. the court became aware that the defendan	nt 🗌 ta	ampered with	circumven	ted 🗌 removed
a court-ordered interlock device without p	rior court a	approval.		
\square d. the defendant was charged with a new vio	olation of N	MCL 257.625.		
\square 5. The interlock device was removed from the def	endant's v	ehicle because) :	
		_		
	Ju	dge signature and	date	

STATE OF MICHIGAN JUDICIAL DISTRICT JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COUNTY

CERTIFICATION TO DEPARTMENT OF STATE (INTERLOCK PROGRAM) Part 2

CASE	NO.	and	JU	DGI
------	-----	-----	----	-----

Court address Court telephone no.

The PEOPLE OF The State of Michigan TO: Department of State 1. The defendant has been admitted into a specialty court program; and an approved, certified ignition interlock device has been installed in each motor vehicle owned or operated, or both, by the defendant as required under MCL 257.625k and MCL 257.625l. 2. Travel is is not allowed under MCL 257.304(4)(b)(xi)). 3. The defendant has successfully completed a specialty court program. 4. Under MCL 600.1084(6), the Secretary of State is informed that: a. the court ordered that the defendant be removed from a specialty court program before he or she successfully completed it. b. the court became aware that the defendant operated a motor vehicle that was not equipped with an interlock device. c. the court became aware that the defendant tampered with circumvented removed a court-ordered interlock device without prior court approval. d. the defendant was charged with a new violation of MCL 257.625. 5. The interlock device was removed from the defendant's vehicle because:						
TO: Department of State 1. The defendant has been admitted into a specialty court program; and an approved, certified ignition interlock device has been installed in each motor vehicle owned or operated, or both, by the defendant as required under MCL 257.625k and MCL 257.625l. 2. Travel is is not allowed under MCL 257.304(4)(b)(xi). 3. The defendant has successfully completed a specialty court program. 4. Under MCL 600.1084(6), the Secretary of State is informed that: a. the court ordered that the defendant be removed from a specialty court program before he or she successfully completed it. b. the court became aware that the defendant operated a motor vehicle that was not equipped with an interlock device. c. the court became aware that the defendant tampered with circumvented removed a court-ordered interlock device without prior court approval. d. the defendant was charged with a new violation of MCL 257.625. 5. The interlock device was removed from the defendant's vehicle because:	THE PEOPLE OF	Defendar	nt's name, address, and telepho	dress, and telephone no.		
TO: Department of State 1. The defendant has been admitted into a specialty court program; and an approved, certified ignition interlock device has been installed in each motor vehicle owned or operated, or both, by the defendant as required under MCL 257.625k and MCL 257.625t. 2. Travel is is not allowed under MCL 257.304(4)(b)(xi). 3. The defendant has successfully completed a specialty court program. 4. Under MCL 600.1084(6), the Secretary of State is informed that: a. the court ordered that the defendant be removed from a specialty court program before he or she successfully completed it. b. the court became aware that the defendant operated a motor vehicle that was not equipped with an interlock device. c. the court became aware that the defendant tampered with circumvented removed a court-ordered interlock device without prior court approval. d. the defendant was charged with a new violation of MCL 257.625. 5. The interlock device was removed from the defendant's vehicle because:	☐ The State of Michigan					
□ 1. The defendant has been admitted into a specialty court program; and an approved, certified ignition interlock device has been installed in each motor vehicle owned or operated, or both, by the defendant as required under MCL 257.625k and MCL 257.625l. □ 2. Travel □ is □ is not allowed under MCL 257.304(4)(b)(xi). □ 3. The defendant has successfully completed a specialty court program. □ 4. Under MCL 600.1084(6), the Secretary of State is informed that: □ a. the court ordered that the defendant be removed from a specialty court program before he or she successfully completed it. □ b. the court became aware that the defendant operated a motor vehicle that was not equipped with an interlock device. □ c. the court became aware that the defendant □ tampered with □ circumvented □ removed a court-ordered interlock device without prior court approval. □ d. the defendant was charged with a new violation of MCL 257.625. □ 5. The interlock device was removed from the defendant's vehicle because:			建設的企業的企業的	理學學是		
device has been installed in each motor vehicle owned or operated, or both, by the defendant as required under MCL 257.625k and MCL 257.625l. 2. Travel is is not allowed under MCL 257.304(4)(b)(xi). 3. The defendant has successfully completed a specialty court program. 4. Under MCL 600.1084(6), the Secretary of State is informed that: a. the court ordered that the defendant be removed from a specialty court program before he or she successfully completed it. b. the court became aware that the defendant operated a motor vehicle that was not equipped with an interlock device. c. the court became aware that the defendant tampered with circumvented removed a court-ordered interlock device without prior court approval. d. the defendant was charged with a new violation of MCL 257.625. 5. The interlock device was removed from the defendant's vehicle because:	TO: Department of State					
 □ 3. The defendant has successfully completed a specialty court program. □ 4. Under MCL 600.1084(6), the Secretary of State is informed that: □ a. the court ordered that the defendant be removed from a specialty court program before he or she successfully completed it. □ b. the court became aware that the defendant operated a motor vehicle that was not equipped with an interlock device. □ c. the court became aware that the defendant □ tampered with □ circumvented □ removed a court-ordered interlock device without prior court approval. □ d. the defendant was charged with a new violation of MCL 257.625. □ 5. The interlock device was removed from the defendant's vehicle because: 	device has been installed in each motor ve					
 □ 4. Under MCL 600.1084(6), the Secretary of State is informed that: □ a. the court ordered that the defendant be removed from a specialty court program before he or she successfully completed it. □ b. the court became aware that the defendant operated a motor vehicle that was not equipped with an interlock device. □ c. the court became aware that the defendant □ tampered with □ circumvented □ removed a court-ordered interlock device without prior court approval. □ d. the defendant was charged with a new violation of MCL 257.625. □ 5. The interlock device was removed from the defendant's vehicle because: 	☐ 2. Travel ☐ is ☐ is not allowed u	nder MCL 257.304(4)(b)(xi).			
 □ a. the court ordered that the defendant be removed from a specialty court program before he or she successfully completed it. □ b. the court became aware that the defendant operated a motor vehicle that was not equipped with an interlock device. □ c. the court became aware that the defendant □ tampered with □ circumvented □ removed a court-ordered interlock device without prior court approval. □ d. the defendant was charged with a new violation of MCL 257.625. □ 5. The interlock device was removed from the defendant's vehicle because: 	\square 3. The defendant has successfully completed	d a specialty court prog	ram.			
successfully completed it. b. the court became aware that the defendant operated a motor vehicle that was not equipped with an interlock device. c. the court became aware that the defendant tampered with circumvented removed a court-ordered interlock device without prior court approval. d. the defendant was charged with a new violation of MCL 257.625.	\square 4. Under MCL 600.1084(6), the Secretary of	State is informed that:				
device. c. the court became aware that the defendant tampered with circumvented removed a court-ordered interlock device without prior court approval. d. the defendant was charged with a new violation of MCL 257.625. 5. The interlock device was removed from the defendant's vehicle because:		be removed from a spe	cialty court program befo	ore he or she		
a court-ordered interlock device without prior court approval. d. the defendant was charged with a new violation of MCL 257.625. 5. The interlock device was removed from the defendant's vehicle because:		endant operated a moto	or vehicle that was not eq	uipped with an interlock		
☐ d. the defendant was charged with a new violation of MCL 257.625. ☐ 5. The interlock device was removed from the defendant's vehicle because:	\square c. the court became aware that the defe	endant 🗌 tampered	with Circumvented	d □ removed		
□ 5. The interlock device was removed from the defendant's vehicle because:	a court-ordered interlock device with	out prior court approval				
	\square d. the defendant was charged with a ne	w violation of MCL 257	.625.			
Judge signature and date	\square 5. The interlock device was removed from the	e defendant's vehicle b	ecause:			
Judge signature and date						
Judge signature and date						
Judge signature and date						
Judge signature and date						
		Judge signat	ure and date			