



# MICHIGAN COURTS NEWS RELEASE

*John Nevin, Communications Director*

Ph: 517-373-0129 Twitter: @MISupremeCourt FB: facebook.com/misupremecourt

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

## **Michigan Supreme Court Announces May 6, 2020 Oral Arguments Schedule**

*Virtual Arguments to be livestreamed on Court's YouTube channel*

LANSING, MI, April 23, 2020 – The Michigan Supreme Court announced today that oral arguments in two cases will be heard on May 6, 2020. The Court will convene to hear the first case beginning at 9:30 a.m. and the second case at 10:15 a.m. Justices will participate in oral argument via Zoom and the attorneys for the parties have all agreed to argue their cases using Zoom.

Oral arguments will be livestreamed at: <http://www.youtube.com/c/MichiganSupremeCourt>

The schedule of arguments is posted on the Supreme Court's oral arguments [homepage](#). Archived video of oral argument will also be posted on YouTube.

*These brief accounts may not reflect the way that some or all of the Court's seven justices view the cases. The attorneys may also disagree about the facts, issues, procedural history, and significance of these cases. For further details about the cases, please contact the attorneys.*

**Wednesday, May 6, 2020  
9:30 a.m.**

### **MOAA 159636**

DAVONTAE SANFORD,  
Plaintiff-Appellant,

William Goodman

v (Appeal from Ct of Appeals)  
(Ct of Claims – Talbot, M.)

STATE OF MICHIGAN,  
Defendant-Appellee.

Christopher Allen

---

In 2008, when plaintiff was 15 years old, he pled guilty to four counts of second-degree murder and felony-firearm. He was sentenced to a prison term, with credit for 198 days he spent in a juvenile facility before he was sentenced. After it was determined that plaintiff was innocent and wrongfully convicted, his conviction was vacated and he was released from prison on June 8, 2016. In 2017, plaintiff filed a complaint in the Court of Claims seeking compensation from defendant under the Wrongful Imprisonment Compensation Act, MCL 691.1751 *et seq.* Defendant acknowledged that plaintiff was entitled to compensation, but the parties disagreed as

to whether he was entitled to compensation for the 198 days he spent in the juvenile facility. The Court of Claims held that plaintiff was not entitled to compensation for the time spent in the juvenile facility, and the Court of Appeals affirmed in an unpublished opinion. The Supreme Court has ordered oral argument on the application to address whether the plaintiff is entitled to compensation under the Wrongful Imprisonment Compensation Act, MCL 691.1751 *et seq.*, for time spent in a juvenile facility before he was convicted of a crime.

MOAA 159874

SUSAN REAUME,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

Gaëtan Gerville-Réache

v

(Appeal from Ct of Appeals)

(Ottawa – Van Allsburg, J.)

TOWNSHIP OF SPRING LAKE,

Defendant-Appellee.

Amanda Zdarsky

---

Plaintiff used her single-family dwelling in Spring Lake Township, in a district zoned R-1 Low Density Residential, as a short-term rental property. The township board subsequently adopted Ordinance 255, which sets forth a registration and licensing procedure for short-term rentals, provides certain limitations for short-term rental activity, and prohibits short-term rentals in districts zoned R-1. The township board also adopted Ordinance 257, which amended the township’s existing zoning ordinance and imported into the zoning ordinance several of the terms defined in Ordinance 255, such as “Limited Short-Term Rental” and “Short-Term Rental.” The township board denied plaintiff’s request for a short-term rental license and denied her appeal, concluding that her use of the home as a short-term rental property was prohibited by Ordinance 255 and that her past use of the property as a short-term rental was not a “grandfathered use” because it was never a lawful use in the R-1 zoning district. The Ottawa Circuit Court affirmed the denial, and the Court of Appeals affirmed the circuit court in a published opinion. The Supreme Court has ordered oral argument on the application to address (1) whether the Court of Appeals improperly relied on the character of the relationship that defines the term “family” in the zoning ordinance in order to conclude that the permitted use of a “Dwelling, Single Family” in the R-1 district does not include short-term rentals; and (2) whether, aside from the definition of “family,” the appellant met her burden of proof to establish that her actual use of 18190 Lovell Road as a short-term rental complied with the permitted use of the property as a “Dwelling, Single Family” before the township adopted Ordinance 255 and Ordinance 257.