

MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT

NOTICE OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATIVE HEARING

Pursuant to Administrative Order No. 1997-11, the Michigan Supreme Court will hold a public administrative hearing on **Wednesday, March 24, 2021**, via video conference (Zoom). The hearing will begin promptly at **9:30 a.m. and adjourn no later than 11:30 a.m.** For those who wish to view the Public Hearing, a live stream can be accessed on the Court's [YouTube](#) channel.

Persons who wish to address the Court regarding matters on the agenda will be allotted three minutes each to present their views, after which the speakers may be questioned by the Justices. Each speaker will receive an invitation to participate in the Zoom meeting; the speakers will be called in order of item number and request to speak. Speakers will join the meeting no later than 9:30 am and will be muted until called on by the Chief Justice. ***** Please be aware that comments offered at a public hearing must pertain directly to an item on the public hearing agenda.***** To reserve a place on the speaker's list, please notify the Office of Administrative Counsel by e-mail at ADMcomment@courts.mi.gov, no later than Friday, March 19, 2021. If you are not able to register to speak by e-mail, you may call the office at 517-373-1239.

The administrative matters on the agenda for this hearing are:

1. 2019-06 [Amendment of MCR 6.302](#)
Published at 506 Mich ____ (2020)
Issue: *Whether to retain the amendment of MCR 6.302 that makes the rule consistent with the Supreme Court's ruling in People v Warren, 505 Mich 196 (2020), and requires a judge to advise a defendant of the maximum possible prison sentence including the possibility of consecutive sentencing.*

2. 2019-35 [Proposed Amendment of MCR 6.502](#)
Published at 506 Mich 1201 (2020)
Issue: *Whether to adopt the proposed amendment of MCR 6.502 that would eliminate the requirement to return successive motions to the filer and would eliminate the prohibition on appeal of a decision made on a motion for relief from judgment. Further, it would require all such motions to be submitted to the assigned judge, and require a trial court to issue an order when it rejects or denies relief.*
3. 2019-48 [Proposed Amendment of MCR 1.109](#)
Published at 506 Mich 1202 (2020)
Issue: *Whether to adopt the proposed amendment of MCR 1.109 that would require a signature from an attorney of record on documents filed by represented parties. This language was inadvertently eliminated when MCR 2.114(C) was relocated to MCR 1.109 as part of the e-Filing rule changes.*
4. 2020-07 [Proposed Alternative Amendments of MCR 6.502](#)
Published at 506 Mich ____ (2020)
Issue: *Whether to adopt either of the proposed alternative amendments of MCR 6.502 that would address the issue of a court's recharacterization of a defendant's motion for relief from judgment that is styled as something other than a motion for relief from judgment.*
5. 2020-16 [Proposed Amendment of MCR 9.261](#)
Published at 506 Mich 1203 (2020)
Issue: *Whether to adopt the proposed amendment of MCR 9.261 that would allow the JTC to share information with two separate divisions of the State Bar of Michigan: the Judicial Qualifications Committee and the Lawyers & Judges Assistance Program.*
6. 2020-17 [Proposed Addition of MCR 3.906](#)
Published at 506 Mich ____ (2020)
Issue: *Whether to adopt the proposed addition of MCR 3.906 that would establish a procedure regarding the use of restraints on a juvenile in court proceedings.*

7. 2020-19 [Proposed Amendment of MCR 2.302](#)
Published at 506 Mich ____ (2020)
Issue: *Whether to adopt the proposed amendment of MCR 2.302 that would require transcripts of audio and video recordings intended to be introduced as an exhibit at trial to be transcribed.*
8. 2020-20 [Proposed Amendment of MCR 2.105](#)
Published at 506 Mich ____ (2020)
Issue: *Whether to adopt the proposed amendment of MCR 2.105 that would establish the manner of service on limited liability companies.*
9. 2020-22 [Amendment of MCR 6.110](#)
Published at 506 Mich ____ (2020)
Issue: *Whether to retain the amendment of MCR 6.110 that requires courts to allow a witness called by the prosecutor or defendant to appear at a preliminary examination as provided for by MCL 766.12.*
10. 2020-24 [Proposed Amendment of Rule 7 of the Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan](#)
Published at 506 Mich ____ (2020)
Issue: *Whether to adopt the proposed amendment of Rule 7 of the Rules Concerning the State Bar of Michigan that would ensure that all main officers (president, vice-president, treasurer, and secretary) move sequentially through the leadership roles of the Board of Commissioners.*
11. 2020-25 [Proposed Rescission of Administrative Order No. 1997-9 and Proposed Addition of Administrative Order No. 2020-X](#)
Published at 506 Mich ____ (2020)
Issue: *Whether to rescind Administrative Order No. 1997-9 and in its place adopt proposed Administrative Order No. 2020-X that would slightly modify the distribution of IOLTA funds to provide for additional access to justice programming and establish a cap on distributions to the Michigan Supreme Court Historical Society.*
12. 2020-26 [Proposed Amendments of MCR 1.109 and 8.119](#)
Published at 506 Mich ____ (2020)

Issue: Whether to adopt the proposed amendments of MCR 1.109 and 8.119 that would allow SCAO flexibility in protecting an individual's personal identifying information and clarify when a court is and is not required to redact protected personal identifying information.