

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In Re James SHAKE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

COA Case No. _____

v.

EXECUTIVE COURT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE
WAYNE COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT,

Related to LCC No. 19-016384-NZ
Hon. Kevin J. Cox

Defendant-Appellee.

Derk A. Wilcox (P66177)
MACKINAC CENTER LEGAL FOUNDATION
140 West Main Street
Midland, MI 48640
(989) 631-0900
wilcox@mackinac.org
Attorney for Plaintiff-Appellant

**COMPLAINT FOR WRIT OF SUPERINTENDING CONTROL
PURSUANT TO MCR 3.302(D) AND 7.203(C)(1)**

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff-Appellant had filed an action in the Wayne County Circuit Court. After a hearing on jurisdiction, the Circuit Court determined that this was properly a matter for the District Court, as the amount in controversy did not meet the minimum requirements for the Circuit Court. The Circuit Court ordered the clerk of the court to prepare the case records and transfer them to the 36th District Court on June 17, 2020.

Plaintiff-Appellant tried several times to pay the required fee and get the case to proceed in the District Court, but was told repeatedly that the file had not been received. Numerous calls

and emails to the Circuit Court failed to resolve the situation. Upon information and belief, the case file appears to have been lost. Plaintiff-Appellant moved the Circuit Court for a writ of mandamus or superintending control to locate the file and complete the transfer, but nothing happened.

Plaintiff-Appellant has no other legal avenue to resolve this situation. An appeal would not have been proper, even if it had been timely filed, as no final order resolving the matter has been entered. Plaintiff-Appellant cannot start anew and file in the District Court because he is outside the statute of limitations. For Plaintiff's case to proceed, it appears that his case must be transferred from the Circuit Court and continue as originally filed.

Because Plaintiff-Appellant believes that there is no contested legal question at issue here, this complaint does not attach a brief of law.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

1. On or about December 6, 2019, Plaintiff-Appellant filed this lawsuit against his previous employer, the UAW, alleging claims of conversion, fraud, and breach of contract. He sought trebled monetary damages and declaratory relief. This case was filed in the Wayne County Circuit, and titled *Shake v UAW*, 19-016384-NZ.
2. On or about April 10, 2020, the Circuit Court ordered the parties to brief the question of jurisdiction. On June 17, 2020, the Circuit Court ordered that the matter was properly in a district court based on the amount in controversy, and ordered the case be transferred to the 36th District Court. Exhibit A.
3. To comply with MCR 2.227(B)(1), on June 30, 2020, Plaintiff-Appellant submitted the filing fee to the District Court, along with a letter and a copy of the Circuit Court's June 17, 2020, Order. Exhibit B.

4. Upon information and belief, at the time Plaintiff-Appellant submitted his filing fee, the 36th District Court was substantially shut down and/or operating in a much-reduced capacity due to COVID-19. Plaintiff-Appellant's counsel sent multiple emails and called the 36th District Court multiple times to inquire about the status of the case's transfer. These calls and emails were not returned.
5. On September 14, 2020, the 36th District Court returned Plaintiff-Appellant's check for the filing fee, and explained that it had not received the file from the 3rd Circuit. Exhibit C.
6. Plaintiff-Appellant submitted another letter to the 36th District Court on November 11, 2020. On January 8, 2021, Plaintiff-Appellant received an email from the 36th District Court explaining that it had still not received the file from the 3rd Circuit. Exhibit D.
7. During this period Plaintiff-Appellant also contacted the 3rd Circuit via e-mail and telephone, but was unable to receive information on the location of this file or its status.
8. On or about March 31, 2021, Plaintiff-Appellant again contacted the 3rd Circuit by phone, and was told that an email had been sent to a clerk to send the file to the 36th District Court.
9. On April 2, 2021, in response to the above phone call, Plaintiff-Appellant again sent a letter and check for the filing fee to the 36th District Court. Exhibit E.
10. On April 20, 2021, the 36th District Court returned Plaintiff-Appellant's check with a letter stating, "Your documents are being returned for the following reason(s). ... Other: Missing Complete Case." Exhibit F.

11. On April 26, 2021, Plaintiff-Appellant filed an “Ex Parte Motion for Mandamus or Superintending Control” with the Circuit Court requesting that the file be located and transferred.
12. Plaintiff-Appellant was unable to secure a hearing date until November 5, 2021.
13. The matter was heard by the Circuit Court without the participation of the parties or an oral argument. Per the Circuit Court’s docket, the matter was heard: “Motion Hearing (9:00 AM) (Judicial Officer Hegarty, Charles S.) Result: Reviewed by Court.” Exhibit G.
14. To date, no further action has been taken, and Plaintiff-Appellant has been unable to continue this matter in the District Court.
15. This court has jurisdiction for superintending control over the Circuit Court pursuant to MCR 3.302(D) and 7.203(C).
16. “The process of seeking an order of superintending control is not an appeal but rather is an original civil action designed to order a defendant to perform a clear legal duty.” *Barham v Workers’ Compensation Appeal Board*, 184 Mich App 121, 127 (1990).
17. “An order of superintending control is not available to a plaintiff who has another adequate remedy by way of an appeal.” *Id.*
18. “When an appeal in the Court of Appeals or the circuit court is available, it must be utilized and a complaint for superintending control must be dismissed.” *Id.*
19. “A superintending control order enforces the superintending power of a court over lower courts or tribunals.” *Id.*
20. “Furthermore, MCR 3.302(D)(1) prescribes that the Supreme Court, Court of Appeals and circuit court have jurisdiction to issue superintending control orders to lower courts

or tribunals. MCR 7.203(C)(1) specifically states that the Court of Appeals may entertain an action for

superintending control over a lower court or a tribunal immediately below it arising out of an action or proceeding which, when concluded, would result in an order appealable to the Court of Appeals.”

Id.

21. “In sum, then, this [Supreme] Court has general system-wide superintending control over the lower courts, whereas, in contrast, the Court of Appeals only has superintending control in an actual case.” *Lapeer County Clerk v Lapeer Circuit Judges*, 465 Mich 559, 569 (2002).
22. The Circuit Court clerk has a clear legal duty to transfer this case.
23. Plaintiff-Appellant has no other remedy available and cannot appeal the failure to transfer or the loss of the court file.
24. This Court of Appeals is the proper court to exercise superintending control over the Circuit Court – the lower court under its authority.

RELIEF SOUGHT

While Plaintiff-Appellant is mindful of the difficulties that the lower courts have had in dealing with the Covid-19 pandemic, this transfer must be resolved, and Plaintiff should be allowed to proceed with his case.

Plaintiff-Appellant requests that this court exercise superintending control over the Circuit Court and order that the case file be found and transferred. If the file cannot be found, then Plaintiff-Appellant requests an order that the file be recreated from the motions and pleadings as originally filed, and transferred to the District Court. Plaintiff-Appellant requests any order or writ that accomplishes the task of completing the transfer as ordered by the Circuit Court.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 15, 2023

By: /s/ Derk A. Wilcox

MACKINAC CENTER LEGAL FOUNDATION

140 W. Main Street

Midland, MI 48640

(989) 631-0900

wilcox@mackinac.org

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Appellant