



Michigan Supreme Court
State Court Administrative Office
Trial Court Services Division
Michigan Hall of Justice
P.O. Box 30048
Lansing, MI 48909

August 18, 2009

TO: Michigan Court Forms Committee (Probate Court Section)

FROM: Traci Gentilozzi, Forms and Manuals Analyst

RE: Agenda and Materials for **September 3, 2009 Meeting**

PLACE: **Michigan Hall of Justice**, 925 West Ottawa, downtown Lansing (map enclosed)

Below is the agenda for the September 3 meeting of the Michigan Court Forms Committee – Probate Court Section. The meeting starts at 9:30 a.m. and ends at 3:30 p.m. **Luncheon reservations have been made for you; if you cannot attend, please contact me at least two days before the meeting.** Please note that we are located at 925 West Ottawa in Lansing. A map is provided.

Although documentation is provided with the agenda, it would be helpful to bring a copy of the Michigan Court Rules and any other resources you believe are necessary.

Notice of Minor Revisions

Forms requiring minor changes, such as spelling, citations, grammar, punctuation, etc., will be corrected by the State Court Administrative Office and provided with the agenda materials, but do not require discussion or approval by the committee. Any of these forms will be discussed if members raise substantive issues or if also included in the agenda for other purposes. These forms will be corrected and distributed in December 2009: PC 110, PC 578, PC 656, PCM 208a, PCM 218, PCM 241, and PCM 242.

A. General and Estate Forms

1. New Form, Petition on Denial of Application for Delayed Registration of Birth and Order

This form is being developed for use in conjunction with DCH-1031, Application to

Establish Delayed Registration of Birth by Court Order. The proposed draft was designed in cooperation with the Michigan Department of Community Health (MDCH), Vital Records & Health Data Services Section. The MDCH has asserted the form will make the process for establishing a delayed record easier, more accurate, and more complete. The controlling statutes are MCL 333.2827 and MCL 333.2828.

According to the MDCH, a person may go to the Vital Records Office to establish a delayed record of birth but, if the documentation is insufficient, the office can deny the application. The person may then go to court to establish the delayed record of birth. There is concern with this because the establishment of a birth record is a way to help individuals create new citizenship documentation, thereby creating a new identity. This is of particular concern after September 11, 2001, and the MDCH wants to prevent this from occurring.

The MDCH seeks to develop a formal procedure that will clearly show the court: (1) the documentation submitted to the MDCH; (2) the documentation not considered acceptable by the MDCH; and (3) the specific facts of birth that still need to be established by the court. The MDCH further believes it would better serve the petitioner if the documentation given to the court is listed on the form. The MDCH would like the petitioner to also list the documentation submitted to the court that the MDCH did not receive. In addition, the letter of denial from the MDCH would set forth the documentation the department did not receive, thereby making it easier for the court to determine the acceptability of the documents.

According to the MDCH, it is extremely important to understand what type of documentation was accepted by the court to establish the fact of birth that the petitioner was not able to establish with the MDCH. This explains why there are two areas on the draft form that list documentation (one for the documents the registrant submits, and one for the documents the court accepts) and the presentation of facts of birth (one for the facts the registrant wants, and one for the facts the court orders).

Attached is a proposed draft form that replaces DCH-1031.

2. MC 304, Order Regarding Alternate Service

The Circuit and District Section of the Michigan Court Forms Committee recently approved a court administrator's request to expand this form for use under MCR 2.107(B)(1)(b). The committee agreed to the following changes:

- (1) item 1 – add checkbox options for “ MCR 2.105” and “ MCR 2.107(B)(1)(b).”
- (2) item 2 – add checkbox options for “ summons and complaint” and “ other: _____.”
- (3) item 2 – change “may be made ...” to “shall be made”
- (4) revise the proof of service fee box.

After agreeing to these changes, the committee referred the revisions to the Probate Section for further discussion. If the Probate Section makes additional changes, the form will be referred back to the Circuit and District Section for its final review in 2010. An excerpt from the minutes of the 2009 Circuit and District Section committee meeting is provided. Are the changes agreed upon by the Circuit and District Section acceptable? Do further revisions need to be made?

3. MC 307, Order for Service by Publication/Posting and Notice of Action

The SCAO suggests this form can be used in civil cases filed in the probate courts and recommends that “County Probate” be added to the masthead and that MCR 5.101(C) be added to the citations at the bottom of the form.

4. PC 558, Application for Informal Probate and/or Appointment of Personal Representative (Testate/Intestate)

A probate court administrator has requested the language in item 7 be reviewed because the second sentence appears to presume there is a will/codicil. It is asserted this statement may need to be conditional rather than presumptive.

See comments received from Janie Diegel.

5. PC 559, Petition for Probate and/or Appointment of Personal Representative (Testate/Intestate)

A probate court administrator has requested the language in item 10 be reviewed because the second sentence appears to presume there is a will/codicil. It is asserted this statement may need to be conditional rather than presumptive.

See comments received from Janie Diegel.

6. PC 564, Proof of Service

The committee is asked to discuss whether the newly-designed proof of service fee box that has been applied to all circuit, district, and friend of the court forms should be applied to this form. The redesigned fee box provides a field for an incorrect address fee, which was requested by the Michigan Court Officer, Deputy Sheriff and Process Servers Association. Form MC 230 is attached as an example. An excerpt from the minutes of the 2009 Circuit and District Section committee meeting is provided.

7. PC 565, Testimony, Interested Persons

The Council of the State Bar Probate and Estate Planning Section has requested the form’s title be changed to “Testimony to Identify Heirs” because MCR 5.302(B) has

been amended, effective May 1, 2009, and now states that “[a]t least one sworn testimony form sufficient to establish the identity of heirs and devisees must be submitted ...” (new language underlined). Previously, the court rule referred to “interested persons.” See the attached e-mail.

Similarly, a probate register has suggested the form be reviewed for compliance with an amendment to MCR 5.125(B)(5) that added a new definition to “interested persons.”

8. PC 566, Supplemental Testimony, Interested Persons

The Council of the State Bar Probate and Estate Planning Section has requested the form’s title be changed to “Supplemental Testimony to Identify Non-Heir Devisees” because MCR 5.302(B) was amended, effective May 1, 2009, and now states that “[a]t least one sworn testimony form sufficient to establish the identity of heirs and devisees must be submitted ...” (new language underlined). Previously, the court rule referred to “interested persons.” See the attached e-mail.

Similarly, a probate register has suggested the form be reviewed for compliance with an amendment to MCR 5.125(B)(5) that added a new definition to “interested persons.”

9. PC 574, Notice to Creditors, Decedent’s Estate

An attorney has suggested that it may not be prudent to publish the decedent’s street address for privacy reasons. It is asserted that it may be sufficient to provide an address for the personal representative at the lawyer’s business office, if a lawyer is involved.

MCL 700.3801 does not require the decedent’s address be listed on the creditor notice, but the statute does say that a personal representative shall publish notice “as provided by supreme court rule” MCR 5.306(A)(1) says the notice to creditors must include: “(1) The name, and, if known, last known address, date of death, and date of birth of the decedent” See the attached communications.

Is it necessary to publish the decedent’s street address on the form? Or, if a lawyer is involved, can the address of the lawyer’s business office be provided instead (on behalf of the personal representative)? If a lawyer is not involved, what information should be provided?

See comments received from Cindy Rude.

10. PC 577, Inventory

The Council of the State Bar Probate and Estate Planning Section has suggested the

references to guardians and conservators be deleted because they are “outdated.” It has been asserted that, due to the development of PC 674 (Inventory, Conservatorship), all references to conservators and guardians on the estate inventory form and instructions should be removed. Specifically, the council has proposed that the two checkboxes at the top of the form be removed: “ date of death (decedent’s estate only)” and “ date of qualification as fiduciary (all other estates).” See the attached e-mail.

The council has also asserted that (1) items 2.c. and 3.e. in the instructions should be deleted and (2) the form’s title should be changed to “Inventory, Decedent’s Estates,” to avoid confusion with PC 674.

See comments received from Cindy Rude.

11. PC 584, Account of Fiduciary, Long Form

A probate court administrator has suggested the column headings on Schedule C be changed to make it clear assets that have not been sold cannot be depreciated on this form.

12. PC 591, Sworn Statement to Close Unsupervised Administration

MCL 700.3954 provides that a personal representative may close an estate by filing with the court a sworn statement, indicating that the personal representative or a previous personal representative has done several things, including “(c) Sent a copy of the statement to all estate distributees and to all creditors or other claimants of whom the personal representative is aware whose claims are neither paid nor barred.” While item 6 on the form includes this statutory requirement, it is questioned whether the current language on the form makes practical sense. Will the personal representative send a copy of the sworn statement at the same time he or she is completing the sworn statement form? A probate court administrator has suggested that item 6 be changed to say (new language underlined): “I will send copies of this sworn statement to all distributees and to all claimants whose claims are neither paid nor barred and to all demandants. ...” In light of this recommendation, should a standard certificate of mailing be added to the form?

In addition, a probate court administrator has requested the language in item 2 be revised to make it clearer that notice has been published, if required by law. The committee did make it clearer in September 2006 by saying, “If required by law or court rule, I have published notice to creditors, and the time for presentment of claims has expired.” The committee considered the form again in 2007, but the incorrect version of the form (3/06) was reviewed. As a result, the committee revised the language to say, “I have published notice to creditors when required by law and the time for presentment of claims has expired,” thereby reverting to the same language that was on the 3/06 version. Will the language on the 9/06 version suffice? The 9/06

version is provided.

13. PC 595, Order for Complete Estate Settlement

It has been questioned whether the language “and the bond, if any, is cancelled” should be deleted in item 15 because discharge of the personal representative and cancellation of the bond typically occur at the same time.

14. PC 600, Notice of Deficiency

A probate register has suggested the fifth checkbox option, Notice of Continued Administration, that was on the 3/00 version of this form be reinstated. It provided: “ Your ‘Notice of Continued Administration’ (form PC 587) has not been filed. The court will administratively close the estate and terminate the authority of the personal representative unless you file within 63 days your Notice of Continued Administration, or your ‘Sworn Statement’ (form PC 591), or ‘Petition for Complete Estate Settlement’ (form PC 593, or ‘Petition for Adjudication of Testacy and Complete Estate Settlement’ (form PC 594), or ‘Petition for Settlement Order.’ It must be filed with the filing fee, if required.” It is asserted that continued administration happens regularly and, therefore, this checkbox option should be reinstated.

Based on the current court rule and statute, MCR 5.203 and MCL 700.3951, should the Notice of Continued Administration checkbox option that was on the 3/00 version be reinstated? See comments made during publication.

See comments received from Cindy Rude.

15. PC 603, Petition and Order for Reinstatement (Estate Not Closed)

This form is currently designed for use in decedent’s estates only. A probate court administrator has suggested the form be redesigned for use with both decedent’s estates and conservatorships. A draft is provided.

See comments received from Cindy Rude.

16. PC 604, Petition for Removal of Personal Representative and Appointment of Successor (Estate Not Closed) and New Form, Application for Appointment of Successor Personal Representative (Estate Not Closed)

The Council of the State Bar Probate and Estate Planning Section has requested that PC 604 be revised to include information relating only to a petition to remove a personal representative and appoint a successor representative, and that a new form be developed for situations where a personal representative’s appointment has been terminated by death, conservatorship, or resignation. It is asserted that MCL

700.3301(1)(f), 700.3609, 700.3610, 700.3611(2), and 700.3614(a) of the Estate and Protected Individuals Code, as well as MCR 5.204, indicate that, in these cases, the appointment of a successor personal representative is to be made informally by application. It has been suggested that MCL 700.3609 and MCL 700.3610 be removed from the cites at the bottom of PC 604, and that MCL 700.3614(a) be changed to MCL 700.3614(b). Drafts are provided. See the attached e-mail.

17. PC 607, Application/Petition to Reopen Estate

A probate court administrator has suggested that item 3 be revised because, if a personal representative has after-discovered assets, the assets should be inventoried again, which would require reopening the estate. It is claimed this could happen within one year of filing the sworn closing statement and would apply even if the personal representative has the power to act.

18. PC 610, Registration of Trust

The Council of the State Bar Probate and Estate Planning Section has requested this form be modified to track new provisions in the Michigan Trust Code, MCL 700.7209 and MCL 700.7210, which become effective April 2010. A draft is provided. See the attached e-mail.

19. PC 617, Declaration of Intent to Give Notice by Publication

MCR 5.114(B)(1) states: “An application, petition, inventory, accounting, proof of claim, or proof of service must be either authenticated by verification under oath by the person making it, or, in the alternative, contain a statement immediately above the date and signature of the maker: ‘I declare under the penalties of perjury that this _____ has been examined by me and that its contents are true to the best of my information, knowledge, and belief.’” PC 617 does not fit the description of a document needing to be verified. Should the declaration be removed?

See comments received from Cindy Rude.

B. Guardianship and Conservatorship Forms

1. Presumptive Heirs

A probate court administrator has asked the committee to discuss the definition of “presumptive heirs” and determine who should be listed as interested persons on certain forms. Specifically, it has been questioned whether the respondent’s parents should be listed as interested persons if there are children because, if there are children, the parents are not presumptive heirs. See MCR 5.125(C)(24) and (C)(25).

It has been requested the following forms be reviewed:

(1) PC 639, Petition for Appointment of Conservator – Should the parents be listed if there are children? (Listed below for discussion on another issue.)

(2) PC 675, Petition to Terminate/Modify Guardianship – Should the table in item 2b. be modified for other possible scenarios? The presumptive heirs of a minor are not always the parents (e.g., they could be deceased) and the minor may have a child of his or her own. See comments made during publication.

(3) PC 676, Petition to Terminate/Modify Conservatorship – Should the parents be listed if there are children?

See comments received from Cindy Rude.

2. PC 625, Petition for Appointment of Guardian of Incapacitated Individual

A probate register has requested that a telephone number for the subject of the petition be added, perhaps near the address.

It has also been suggested that the age of any minor be included in item 10, similar to PC 558.

3. PC 637, Order Following Review of Guardianship

The Council of the State Bar Probate and Estate Planning Section has suggested that changes be made to make it clear to guardians they must continue to file annual reports after an annual review is completed. It is asserted that guardians often misread the form to mean that guardianship is simply continued and they only need to be concerned with the next review date. The council has also proposed other changes to make the form “more cohesive.” A draft is provided. See the attached e-mail.

See comments received from Eva Sylvester.

4. PC 638a, Order Regarding Appointment of Guardian/Conservator

Last year the committee separated former PC 638, Petition to Terminate or Modify Guardianship/Petition to Terminate or Modify Conservatorship, into two forms – PC 675 for guardianships and PC 676 for conservatorships. At that time, the SCAO asked whether the order, PC 638a, should also be separated because there are now two petitions for guardianships and conservatorships. The committee tabled the issue until 2009. An excerpt of the meeting minutes is provided. Should the orders be separated? See comments made during publication.

See comments received from George Strander.

5. PC 639, Petition for Appointment of Conservator

A probate register has suggested that a telephone number for the subject of the petition be included, perhaps near the address.

It has also been suggested that the age of any minor be included in item 9, similar to PC 558.

6. PC 640, Order Regarding Appointment of Conservator

The Council of the State Bar Probate and Estate Planning Section has suggested the term “protected person” be replaced with “protected individual” because this is the term used in the Estate and Protected Individuals Code, section 1106(t).

7. PC 645, Letters of Conservatorship

A probate court administrator has suggested the “restrictions” section be revised to clarify that the conservator “shall not sell, mortgage, encumber, or otherwise dispose of any interest in real property without a prior court order of approval from this court” (new language underlined).

8. PC 651, Petition for Appointment of Guardian of Minor

A probate register has requested that the mother’s and father’s telephone numbers be included on the form.

See comments received from George Strander and Terry Beagle.

9. PC 657, Order Following Hearing to Terminate Minor Guardianship

A probate register has asserted that the form no longer needs to include language regarding guardianships established before December 20, 1990, because minors under guardianships prior to that date are now over age 18 and the guardianships have terminated. Therefore, it is suggested the phrase “established after December 20, 1990” be removed in item 4 and that item 5 be deleted.

10. PC 658, Petition for Appointment of Guardian, Individual with Alleged Developmental Disability

A probate register has suggested that a telephone number for the subject of the petition be included, perhaps near the address.

11. PC 660, Order Appointing Guardian for Individual with a Developmental Disability

A probate register has suggested that language be added for the appointment of an emergency temporary guardian. A draft is provided. Should language be added to the current form? Or should a new form be developed under MCL 330.1607(1), as

suggested by a probate judge? It is also suggested that, if a new form is developed, it should allow for designation of the court to exercise powers as a temporary guardian. No draft of the proposed new form is provided.

See comments received from Cindy Rude and Eva Sylvester and a draft order used in Calhoun County.

12. PC 663, Report of Guardian on Condition of Individual with Developmental Disability

A probate register has requested that item 12 be revised to reflect items 7 and 8 on PC 634, Annual Report of Guardian on Condition of Legally Incapacitated Individual. Form PC 634 is included for reference.

13. PC 669, Proof of Restricted Account and Annual Verification of Funds on Deposit

A probate register has suggested that the following underlined language, or something similar, be added to the form: “Attached is a copy of the corresponding financial institution’s statement as of the end of the annual account date.” It is asserted that it is time consuming to review information attached to the form and this directive would help simplify the process.

The committee has previously addressed this issue. In 2007, the committee declined a request to include instructions for the financial institution to indicate that the balance is as of the end of the accounting period. Members concluded the financial institution is not going to have this information and decided it is acceptable for the balance to be as of the date of the verification. In 2008 the committee approved the statement that is currently on the form, but declined to add more precise instructions for proper completion of the form. Members decided that balance information need not match the balance on the account and revised the language to better track MCR 5.409(C)(4).

See comments received from Eva Sylvester, Janie Diegel, and Cindy Rude.

14. PC 671, Order for Administrative Closing (Conservatorship)

The Council of the State Bar Probate and Estate Planning Section has suggested the term “protected person” be replaced with “protected individual” because this is the term used in the Estate and Protected Individuals Code, section 1106(t).

15. PC 673, Petition and Order to Use Funds (Conservatorship)

Several members of the legal community have raised questions regarding standards that financial institutions must follow for restricted orders in a conservatorship. A situation arose where a conservator allegedly forged new orders and obtained more money, and the forged orders were based on photocopies that did not contain original

seals. The financial institution apparently claimed it did not have a duty to demand an original. To avoid further situations like this, the Calhoun County Probate Court adds an instruction to the financial institution (at the bottom of the form) to only accept a certified copy with the raised court seal and to retain the certified copy so it cannot be used again. See the attached form used by the probate court. Would it be beneficial to have a similar instruction on the SCAO-approved form?

See comments received from Cindy Rude.

16. PC 674, Inventory (Conservatorship)

The Council of the State Bar Probate and Estate Planning Section has suggested that the term “protected person” be replaced with “protected individual” because this is the term used in the Estate and Protected Individuals Code, section 1106(t).

See comments received from Cindy Rude.

17. PC 677, Petition to Terminate/Modify Guardian for Alleged Developmentally Disabled Individual

A probate judge and a probate register have requested that “alleged” be removed from the title of the form. It is asserted that “alleged” is inaccurate because, by the time this form is used, a guardian would have been appointed and a judicial determination would have been made that the person is in fact developmentally disabled.

A probate court has also suggested that space be added for the ward’s current address and/or guardian.

18. New Form, Notice of Proceedings Concerning American Indian Child

Last year the committee considered a request to create a form for use in guardianship proceedings under the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA). The committee was informed that an SCAO work group regarding ICWA had been established and, therefore, the committee tabled the issue and referred the matter to the ICWA work group. See an excerpt from the meeting minutes. The ICWA work group has completed its primary goal, which was to recommend court rules, and did not discuss court forms. Therefore, the proposed form is being placed before the committee again, for development under 25 USC 1912. It is suggested the form could be modeled after JC 48, which is attached for reference.

See comments received from Cindy Rude.

19. New Form, Petition for Guardianship Pursuant to Nomination

A request has been made to develop a form under MCL 700.5202 for guardianships

pursuant to nomination. A draft is provided.

See comments received from Cindy Rude.

C. Mental Health Forms

1. PCM 201, Petition/Application for Hospitalization

A member of the general public has suggested this form be modified to better reflect the Mental Health Code, PA 258 of 1974. It is asserted the form needs to clearly distinguish between admission by petition and admission by medical certification. No specific suggestions have been provided. See the attached e-mail.

The committee addressed this issue in 2006 and 2007. Both times the committee concluded it was appropriate to combine the petition and application into one form, and that the form would be understandable by the mental health community.

See comments received from Dan Jakeway.

2. PCM 209a, Supplemental Petition for Examination/Hospitalization and Order

A probate court administrator has suggested that, in order to avoid redundancy on the order section of the form, the first checkbox option in item 11 be moved into item 10, and the second checkbox option in item 11 be deleted. A draft is provided.

3. PCM 211, Notice of Hospitalization and Certificate of Service

A probate judge has requested the form include a line in item 1 for the name of the hospital where the respondent is admitted.

See comments received from Dan Jakeway and Cindy Rude.

4. PCM 214, Initial Order Following Hearing on Petition for Admission

A member of the general public has suggested that item 6 be revised to include the following language: "Stipulation to entry of the order does not imply an effective order of an involuntary commitment, but it merely postpones the entry of an order, and the patient reserves the right to refuse treatment at any time and demand a hearing." It is asserted the second checkbox option in item 6 is misleading.

A request has also been made to insert "SCAO-Approved, use of form, verbatim, mandatory" in the upper left-hand corner of the form, rather than just "Approved, SCAO." See the attached e-mail.

See comments from Dan Jakeway.

5. PCM 214a, Order Following Hearing on Petition for Judicial Admission

A probate judge has inquired why the form does not accommodate the hospitalization of a person with a developmental disability when that person is before the court on a petition for judicial admission pursuant to MCL 330.1518, but the type of hospitalization needed is prescribed by Chapter 4 of the Mental Health Code. There appears to be no specific relationship between Chapters 4 and 5 in regard to the different hospitalization needs of the person with a developmental disability. Thus, when a petition is brought under Chapter 5, the remedies of Chapter 4 do not appear to be available to the judge, even though the situation is such that those are the more appropriate remedies. Can PCM 214a be used under Chapter 4? Or is this a legislative issue?

6. PCM 217a, Order to Modify Order for Alternative Treatment or Combined Hospitalization and Alternative Treatment

In 2007 the committee suggested forms be created pursuant to MCL 330.1519 and asked the SCAO to prepare drafts for discussion in 2008. After reviewing the relevant statutes and the current forms, the SCAO informed the committee in 2008 that no new forms needed developed and that PCM 217a is the proper form to be used. Discussion on whether to revise PCM 217a was tabled until 2009. An excerpt from the meeting minutes is provided. Should the form be modified for use under MCL 330.1519?

7. PCM 219, Second or Continuing Order for Treatment

A probate court administrator has requested the respondent's date of birth be included on the form because sometimes it is difficult to identify people with the same last name. In these situations, is the file number a distinguishing factor?

8. PCM 220, Petition for Discharge from Continuing Treatment or Judicial Admission
PCM 222, Order Following Hearing on Petition for Discharge from Continuing Treatment or Judicial Admission

A probate judge has noted that item 4 allows a patient to continuously file petitions. Should the form be revised to discourage excessive filings?

Also, item 3 needs to be corrected to reflect current law. Several members of the legal community have advised the SCAO that item 3 is inapplicable to mentally incapacitated individuals because MCL 330.1485 was repealed in 1997. When the previous version of the form (9/96) was resurrected by the committee last year, item 3 should have been updated but was not.

A probate register has also suggested the committee consider separating PCM 220 into two forms: one for continuing treatment and one for judicial admissions. It

is asserted that judicial admission and continuing treatment are distinct concepts and, therefore, two forms would be less confusing. Should the form be separated? If so, this would mean that PCM 222 would also need to be separated.

See comments received from Cindy Rude.

9. PCM 235, Request to Defer Hearing on Commitment

A probate register has asserted this form is rarely completed correctly and has suggested the following revisions.

(1) Item 1 – delete the words “one of” so the form states, “I agree to the following:”

(2) Item 1 – modify the checkboxes as follows:

a. Hospitalization in/at _____

Name of hospital

b. Initial hospitalization shall not exceed _____ days.

c. Inpatient hospital treatment shall not exceed 60 days.

d. Alternative treatment under the supervision of _____

Name of agency/CMH

shall not exceed 90 days.

e. Terms of alternative treatment: _____

(3) Delete the current item 2 because it has been combined with item 1.

(4) Renumber items 3 and 4 accordingly.

Attachments

cc: Steven D. Capps
Anne Boomer
Sally LaCross
Amy Byrd
Jennifer Warner
Judicial Information Systems
Regional Administrators



Michigan Supreme Court
State Court Administrative Office
Trial Court Services Division
Michigan Hall of Justice
P.O. Box 30048
Lansing, MI 48909

August 18, 2009

George M. Strander
Chair, Michigan Court Forms Committee
Ingham County Probate Court
303 West Kalamazoo St.
Lansing, MI 48933

Dear George:

Enclosed is the agenda and all materials for the September 3, 2009 meeting of the Michigan Court Forms Committee – Probate Section.

As in previous years, you will be presiding over the meeting as chairperson. Thank you for continuing in this position.

If you have any questions, please call me 517-373-2217.

Sincerely,

Traci R. Gentilozzi
Forms and Manuals Analyst
Trial Court Services

Enclosures