

Order

Michigan Supreme Court
Lansing, Michigan

May 20, 2020

Bridget M. McCormack,
Chief Justice

ADM File No. 2019-41

David F. Viviano,
Chief Justice Pro Tem

Proposed Amendment of
Rule 4.201 of the Michigan
Court Rules

Stephen J. Markman
Brian K. Zahra
Richard H. Bernstein
Elizabeth T. Clement
Megan K. Cavanagh,
Justices

On order of the Court, this is to advise that the Court is considering an amendment of Rule 4.201 of the Michigan Court Rules. Before determining whether the proposal should be adopted, changed before adoption, or rejected, this notice is given to afford interested persons the opportunity to comment on the form or the merits of the proposal or to suggest alternatives. The Court welcomes the views of all. This matter also will be considered at a public hearing. The notices and agendas for public hearings are posted at [Administrative Matters & Court Rules page](#).

Publication of this proposal does not mean that the Court will issue an order on the subject, nor does it imply probable adoption of the proposal in its present form.

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

Rule 4.201 Summary Proceedings to Recover Possession of Premises

(A)-(B) [Unchanged.]

(C) Summons.

(1) [Unchanged.]

(2) The summons must state whether or not the action is brought in the county or district in which the premises or any part of the premises is situated.

~~(3)~~ The summons must also include the following advice to the defendant:

(a)-(d) [Unchanged.]

(e) The defendant has a right to have the case tried in the proper county, district, or court. The case will be transferred to the proper county, district, or court if the defendant moves the court for such transfer.

(D)-(E) [Unchanged.]

(F) Appearance and Answer; Default.

(1)-(2) [Unchanged.]

(3) Right to Proper Venue. If the plaintiff has indicated on the summons that the premises or any part of the premises is situated in a different county or district, the court must inform the defendant, at the hearing scheduled pursuant to section (C)(1) of this rule, of the right to motion the court to transfer the case to the county or district where the premises or any part of the premises is situated and that such a motion will be granted.

(a) The court may order change of venue on its own motion.

(b) A motion to change venue pursuant to this subrule and MCL 600.5706(4) may be made in writing before the date listed on the summons, pursuant to section (C)(1) of this rule, or orally in response to the court's advisement in this subrule.

(c) Transfer of the case shall be pursuant to MCR 2.223.

(3)-(5) [Renumbered (4)-(6) but otherwise unchanged.]

(G)-(O) [Unchanged.]

Staff comment: The proposed amendment of MCR 4.201 would require disclosure of the right to object to venue in actions brought under the Summary Proceedings Act for landlord/tenant proceedings in district court, consistent with MCL 600.5706.

The staff comment is not an authoritative construction by the Court. In addition, adoption of an amendment in no way reflects a substantive determination by this Court.

A copy of this order will be given to the Secretary of the State Bar and to the State Court Administrator so that they can make the notifications specified in MCR 1.201. Comments on the proposal may be sent to the Supreme Court Clerk in writing or electronically by September 1, 2020, at P.O. Box 30052, Lansing, MI 48909, or ADMcomment@courts.mi.gov. When filing a comment, please refer to ADM File No.

2019-41. Your comments and the comments of others will be posted under the chapter affected by this proposal at [Proposed & Recently Adopted Orders on Admin Matters page](#).



I, Larry S. Royster, Clerk of the Michigan Supreme Court, certify that the foregoing is a true and complete copy of the order entered at the direction of the Court.

May 20, 2020

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Larry S. Royster", written over a horizontal line.

Clerk