

APPELLATE PRACTICE SECTION  
Respectfully submits the following position on:

\*

ADM File No. 2013-36 – Proposed Amendments of Subchapter  
7.300 of the Michigan Court Rules

\*


The Appellate Practice Section is not the State Bar of Michigan itself, but rather a Section which members of the State Bar choose voluntarily to join, based on common professional interest.

The position expressed is that of the Appellate Practice Section only and is not the position of the State Bar of Michigan.

At this time, the State Bar does not have a position on this matter.

The total membership of the Appellate Practice Section is 898.

The position was adopted after discussion and vote at a scheduled meeting. The number of members in the decision-making body is 23. The number who voted in favor to this position was 18. The number who voted opposed to this position was 0.





**Report on Public Policy Position**

**Name of section:**

Appellate Practice Section

**Contact person:**

Nancy Vayda Dembinski

**E-Mail:**

[ndembinski@lmdlaw.com](mailto:ndembinski@lmdlaw.com)

**Proposed Court Rule or Administrative Order Number:**

2013-36 – Proposed Amendments of Subchapter 7.300 of the Michigan Court Rules

These proposed amendments would update the rules regarding practice in the Michigan Supreme Court, and would renumber and reorganize the rules to be consistent with those in the Court of Appeals for the ease of the appellate practitioner and greater judicial efficiency.

**Date position was adopted:**

December 19, 2014

**Process used to take the ideological position:**

Position adopted after discussion and vote at a scheduled meeting

**Number of members in the decision-making body:**

23

**Number who voted in favor and opposed to the position:**

18 Voted for position

0 Voted against position

0 Abstained from vote

5 Did not vote

**The text of any legislation, court rule, or administrative regulation that is the subject of or referenced in this report.**

[http://courts.mi.gov/Courts/MichiganSupremeCourt/rules/court-rules-admin-matters/Court%20Rules/2013-36\\_2014-10-22\\_formatted%20order\\_FINAL.pdf](http://courts.mi.gov/Courts/MichiganSupremeCourt/rules/court-rules-admin-matters/Court%20Rules/2013-36_2014-10-22_formatted%20order_FINAL.pdf)

**Explanation of the position, including any recommended amendments:**

See attached letter.

APPELLATE PRACTICE SECTION

OFFICERS  
CHAIR

Nancy Vayda Dembinski  
Landry Mazzeo & Dembinski PC  
37000 Grand River Ave Ste 200  
Farmington Hills, MI 48335-2881

CHAIR-ELECT

Beth A. Wittmann, *Detroit*

SECRETARY

Gactan Edward Alain Gerville-  
Reache, *Grand Rapids*

TREASURER

Stephanie Simon Morita  
*Farmington Hills*

COUNCIL

Geoffrey M. Brown  
*Southfield*

Anthony F. Caffrey, III  
*Royal Oak*

Graham K. Crabtree  
*Lansing*

Judith A. Curtis  
*Grosse Pointe*

Lauren DuVal Donofrio  
*Lansing*

Conor B. Dugan  
*Grand Rapids*

Barbara H. Goldman  
*Southfield*

Richard C. Kraus  
*Lansing*

Ronald S. Lederman  
*Southfield*

Mark J. Magyar  
*Grand Rapids*

Marla R. McCowan  
*Detroit*

Gerald F. Posner  
*Detroit*

Bridget Brown Powers  
*Petoskey*

Larry J. Saylor  
*Detroit*

Ann M. Sherman  
*Lansing*

Elizabeth L. Sokol  
*Birmingham*

Jeanne Geha Swanson  
*Detroit*

COMMISSIONER LIAISON

Hon. Michael J. Riordan, *Detroit*

EX OFFICIO

Phillip J. DeRosier, *Detroit*

Lisa R. Speaker, *Lansing*

Jill M. Wheaton, *Ann Arbor*

December 22, 2014

Larry S. Royster  
Clerk of the Court  
Michigan Supreme Court  
Michigan Hall of Justice  
925 W. Ottawa, P.O. Box 30052  
Lansing, MI 48909

Re: ADM File No. 2013-36 – Appellate Practice Section Comment on Proposed Amendments of Subchapter 7.300 of the Michigan Court Rules

Dear Mr. Royster:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed amendments of Subchapter 7.300 of the Michigan Court Rules. The Council for the SBM Appellate Practice Section lauds the Court's efforts to clarify the rules and conform to the organization of Subchapter 7.200 for appeals in the Court of Appeals. On behalf of the Appellate Practice Section, we offer the following comments for the Court's consideration.

**MCR 7.305(A)(2).** The Section suggests that this subsection be renumbered to MCR 7.305(A)(1)(g), consistent with the current MCR 7.302(A)(1)(g).

**MCR 7.305(F).** The Section has concerns about the following language: "The submission to the clerk of a nonconforming pleading does not satisfy the time limitation for filing the pleading." This is new language that currently is found only in MCR 7.309(A)(2), which applies to briefs and appendixes. Including this language in the rule concerning applications for leave to appeal suggests that a nonconforming application could be found not to meet the jurisdictional filing deadline, which is not subject to a motion to extend time. The language is also problematic as applied to briefs (including merits briefs and opposing and reply briefs at the application stage) because it encourages a proliferation of motions to extend time. The Section recommends that this language be modified to clarify that nonconforming applications and briefs will be considered timely if they are corrected within the time specified in the Clerk's defect notice and not stricken, similar to the practice in the Court of Appeals. A corresponding change should be made to the identical language in MCR 7.306(F) (original proceedings).

**MCR 7.307(B).** The Section thanks the Court for adopting its proposal for clarifying when cross-appeals are required, and recommends that the new language be incorporated into MCR 7.207 (cross-appeals in the Court of Appeals).

APPELLATE PRACTICE SECTION

**MCR 7.312(D)(2).** This subrule revises language concerning appendix headers, providing that “[e]ach page of the Appendix must include a header that briefly describes the character of the appendix, such as the names of witnesses for testimonial evidence or the nature of the documents for record evidence.” The Section believes that it is awkward to refer to individual pages of an appendix as an “appendix,” and suggests revising this language as follows: “Each page of the Appendix must include a header that briefly describes the character of the appendix document, such as the names of witnesses for testimonial evidence or the nature of the documents for record evidence.”

**MCR 7.312(G).** The Section recommends that the Court adopt a briefing schedule for cross-appeals similar to that in the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. See FR App P 28.1(F) (providing that the appellee’s response brief and principal brief on cross-appeal both be filed after the appellant’s principal brief, as opposed to the appellant’s principal brief and appellee’s principal brief on cross-appeal being filed simultaneously).

Thank you again for offering us the opportunity to provide input on this proposal.

Very truly yours,



Nancy V. Dembinski  
Chair, Appellate Practice Section