

From: Michael Ross <MRoss@oaspc.com>
To: "ADMcomment@courts.mi.gov" <ADMcomment@courts.mi.gov>
Date: 2/19/2015 10:04 AM
Subject: ADM File Number 2014-09

Please consider this my comments concerning the proposed amendments to the Michigan Court Rules governing unpublished court of appeals decisions. The proposed change is absurd. Unpublished opinions are actual decisions of the court of appeals in actual cases and therefore persuasive authority even though not binding as precedent. Why should I have to explain why I am citing it? If the Supreme Court or the Court of Appeals do not like unpublished opinions, then do away with them altogether and publish everything coming out of the Court of Appeals like we do everything coming out of the Supreme Court. The presumed original justification for their non-precedential status and for the requirement that they be attached to the Brief (not readily accessible) no longer exists with everything online now. The Court of Appeals frequently violates the setting the standards for publishing opinions anyway, so why even bother maintaining the artificial distinction?