STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF LICENSING AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS
CANNABIS REGULATORY AGENCY

In the Matter of

Misspres, LLC
dba BAG N TAG LLC **ENF No: 26-00755**
License No. AU-P-000610
_____/

FORMAL COMPLAINT

The Cannabis Regulatory Agency (CRA) by and through its attorneys, Assistant Attorney General Sarah E. Huyser, files this formal complaint against Misspres, LLC dba BAG N TAG LLC (Respondent), alleging upon information and belief as follows:

1. The CRA is authorized under the Michigan Regulation and Taxation of Marihuana Act (MRTMA), MCL 333.27951 *et seq.*, to investigate alleged violations of the MRTMA and administrative rules promulgated thereunder, take disciplinary action to prevent such violations, and impose fines and other sanctions against applicants and licensees that violate the MRTMA or administrative rules.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

2. Respondent holds an active state license under the MRTMA to operate an adult use marijuana processor business in the State of Michigan.

3. Respondent operated at 26700 Liberal Suite 2, Center Line, MI 48015, at all times relevant to this complaint.

4. Following an investigation, the CRA determined that Respondent violated the MRTMA and/or administrative rules promulgated thereunder as set forth below.

5. On May 7, 2026, Michigan State Police Marijuana and Tobacco Investigations Section (MTIS) executed a search warrant at the location of a hemp processor handler and found marijuana and marijuana products containing tags from the seed-to-sale tracking system, Metrc.

6. While investigating Metrc tags associated with products found by MTIS, various regulation agents (RAs) conducted an onsite visit to Respondent's business location on July 1, 2026.

7. While onsite, RAs made observations several boxes and bags of marijuana in the garage that did not have readily apparent Metrc identifiers.

a. Two boxes were labeled "Pillar Canna to Bag N Tag AU-P-000610." RAs opened these boxes to find large bags of marijuana.

i. Box 1 had two large bags of shake/trim without compliance or Metrc labels. One of the bags had a plant tag attached to it.

ii. Box 2 had three large bags of marijuana shake/trim which also did not have compliance or Metrc labels. Two of the bags had plant tags attached to them.

iii. Inside one of the boxes was a strip of seven package tags but Respondent's employee confirmed that no additional boxes came from this shipment and was unable to provide any explanation about the random tags in the box.

iv. Respondent's compliance manager was able to produce a transfer manifest for this product and agreed that the bags should have been clearly

marked and tagged. She further agreed plant tags should not have been included. The intent of the product was to combine all the bags into one package with a new package tag and use it to create pre-rolls.

v. According to the tag with the manifest, these tags were delivered on June 24, 2026, and not accepted until June 29, 2026.

b. Another group of boxes with multiple bags without Metrc tags, manifests, or any other associated documentation was found. The employee onsite could not explain anything about marijuana and why it was not tagged.

i. The employee, compliance manager, and owner were unable to determine where this marijuana came from.

ii. A total of 22 bags were found without Metrc tags weighing approximately 364.3 pounds. Respondent provided a screenshot with the tags they believed these to be associated with.

iii. The compliance manager claimed that approximately 60 pounds were associated with Metrc tags 1A405030005A4ED000008684 (8684) and 1A405030005A4ED000006161 (6161). This did not account for the remining 300 plus pounds.

iv. Respondent stated that this product came from multiple manifests over time and they could not identify the product. Respondent further stated the product was at the business for at least two months and moved around as needed.

v. After attempting to observe the movement on video surveillance, the marijuana was moved to and from various boxes, packages were combined, and the product was not logged when product was ground or combined together.

vi. On July 2, 2026, the day after the onsite visit, tags 8684 and 6161 were combined with 13 other packages to create one large package of shake/trim weighing 535.71 pounds under tag 1A405030005A4ED000006128 (6128).

c. Next to the scale, five additional bags of untagged and untracked marijuana were found totally 155.8 pounds. Respondent could not explain where this marijuana came from.

8. On the day of the onsite, RAs were shown around the rest of the business. RAs observed a room where employees were making pre-rolls. The distillate in this room did not indicate where the distillate originated from and each label was identical—including weight.

9. Before leaving the business, RAs confirmed with Respondent that 30 days of video surveillance was available and asked them to retain that video.

10. On the same day as the site visit, RA followed up with an email asking for various SOPs, all relevant manifests, invoices, and Metrc package numbers associated with the untagged product observed, any explanations on how these products were left untagged, and any corrective action that they intend to make.

a. A deadline of July 7, 2026 was provided for all the above information.

11. On July 6, 2026, RA used Metrc to track the distillate attached to Metrc tag 1A40503005A4ED000002213 (2213) that was being used on the production floor. The tag trace showed:

a. The product went from the original processor to two more before being shipped to Respondent on February 12, 2026.

b. The product was 30,000 grams of distillate.

c. The shipment was accepted on February 17, 2026 into inventory.

d. Per Metrc, three child packages were made by Respondent on March 28, 2026. All these child packages were combined to make pre-rolls and were completely used in March of 2026. No additional product should have been onsite under this tag number.

12. Another site visit was conducted on July 8, 2026. RAs asked to see the distillate that was observed during the previous site visit. The distillate that was observed is no longer onsite. The owner reported it was tested, mixed with terpenes, and infused into pre-rolls all after the RAs left on July 1, 2026. The combined package, referenced above, was created on July 2, 2026.

a. The employee onsite was asked how the Metrc tag on the distillate could still be in use when it had been reported as finished four months prior. The employee stated he was the one who made the child packages and must have made a mistake in tracking.

b. When asked why there was product left onsite after being reported as being used up, the employee stated they made a batch or pre-rolls in March/April to have them tested and continued creating items. He was unaware that the full batch of product needed to be created and the testing facility needs access too the full amount to pull a representative sample for testing.

13. While onsite for the second visit, the compliance manager provided outdated SOPs for Flower Acceptance, Verification and repackaging; Testing and Sampling; and Alarm System and Controlled Area Access. They did not have a SOP created for combining tags.

14. RAs asked to review video while onsite, no one there had access to the surveillance system. The only person with access was the owner.

15. RAs asked about the 22 bags of shake/trim that were previously found in the garage area on their last visit. They were informed that it was all combined together to create one larger package.

16. Several more tracking/tagging issues were also found during the second onsite visit.

a. In the vault area, there was a bin with two Metrc tags associated with it: 1A405030000F48A000008855 (8855) and 1A405030000F48A000008886 (8886). Inside the bin were four bags of marijuana that did not have identifying tags to show if they were associated with either 8855 or 8886.

b. Three additional untagged bags of flower were found in the vault area. No one was able to say where the bags came from, what they were, or what Metrc tag they are associated with.

c. RAs found three more bins of untagged product broke down into one-pound bags with various strain names written on them but no Metrc tags. Respondent was able to trace those back to a manifest.

17. RA sent an email on July 9, 2026, with questions from both site visits in an attempt to understand how the untagged product was identified and tracked after it was unlabeled onsite. RA also asked that the licensee preserve video regarding the Pillar Canna product, the distillate that was moved for use in pre-rolls between visits, and the untagged product that was subsequently tagged and combined.

a. Respondent responded with a transfer manifest they purported was for the trim that was combined to create the package weighing 535.71 pounds (6128).

b. They explained how these products weren't retagged properly because they were in the process of doing so and the unused tags were grouped together on an employee's desk.

c. Respondent said they were not certain about the Pure Canna products that were referenced because they did not have a manifest that was accepted on 6/29/26.

d. Regarding the distillate that was there during the first onsite but used before the second visit, Respondent was not sure why a discrepancy in the amounts in Metrc exists. Respondent understood that it is not compliance to have five jars of untagged distillate on hand when they cannot say where they came from.

18. Numerous additional email conversations existed between the CRA and Respondent to determine the accurate source and package tags for the untagged product. There were various explanations and incidents of tags being misplaced. Respondent ultimately stated they are working to reconcile their physical and Metrc inventory while maintaining efficiency and organization in their daily workflow.

19. A flash drive that purported to contain the requested video surveillance was picked up by the CRA on July 16, 2026 and subsequently reviewed.

a. A video labeled "Pillar Drop off (garage)" shows that the product from Pillar Canna was received on June 29, 2026, was accepted and signed for but never inspected in any way.

b. The video labeled "Distillate Moved to Floor" contained a box of distillate that was already by the desk area when it starts. It did not show when the distillate was moved from the back table where RAs saw it on the first visit.

c. The video labeled "Trim Repackaged" started shortly after RAs left the first onsite visit. It shows the 22 bags of untagged marijuana and the 5 bags that were closer to the scale all being combined. The bags from Pillar Canna were not included.

d. All the requested video was not contained on this flash drive.

20. Through an additional series of emails beginning July 29, 2026, RA attempted to determine what SOPs were being followed, how the product in question was being tracked, and whether the video being requested would be provided.

a. Respondent provided updated SOPs and an invoice from another licensee that was dated June 12, 2026.

b. Respondent stated they were able to determine that the distillate observed by the RAs was mis-tagged simply by looking at the quantity between what was onsite and what was in Metrc. They stated they have updated SOPs to prevent this and the attached manifest was for the distillate. The source tag reported was 1A4050300057ABD000000089 (089).

c. RA conducted a package trace of package 089. If the product was from this package that would mean that those 5 liters (5,000 grams) of distillate is actually the 6,979 grams that was used to create package 6160. The traces as reported by Respondent do not line up and are not possible when reconciled with Metrc.

d. Respondent indicated that they do not have production logs for distillate or child package creation but will be implementing them in the future for better tracking.

21. On August 4, 2026, a flash drive was picked up from Respondent that purported to have the missing surveillance video.

a. One video labeled "bvape" is dated July 2, 2026, and shows the table where the distillate was found in a closed box. It is unsure what is in the box.

b. Another video named "flower" contained one photo and five videos. The videos are all dated July 8, 2026, and did not provide anything of value as to what was requested.

COUNT 1

Respondent's actions described above demonstrate a violation of Rule 420.103(3), which states that a marijuana processor must accurately enter all transactions, current inventory, and other information into the statewide monitoring system (Metrc).

COUNT 2

Respondent's actions described above demonstrate a violation of Rule 420.206(12), which states that a marijuana business shall maintain records of formulation and make them available to the agency upon request.

COUNT 3

Respondent's actions described above demonstrate a violation of Rule 420.206a(1), which states that a marijuana business must have up-to-date written standard operating procedures on site at all times.

COUNT 4

Respondent's actions described above demonstrate a violation of Rule 420.206a(2), which states that standard operating procedures must be made available to the agency upon request.

COUNT 5

Respondent's actions described above demonstrate a violation of Rule 420.209(6)(a)(i), which states that a licensee shall ensure the video surveillance records any areas where marihuana products are weighed, packed, stored, loaded, and unloaded for transportation, prepared, or moved within the marijuana business.

COUNT 6

Respondent's actions described above demonstrate a violation of Rule 420.209(6)(a)(ii), which states that a licensee shall ensure the video surveillance system records limited access areas and security rooms including any transfers between rooms.

COUNT 7

Respondent's actions described above demonstrate a violation of Rule 420.209(11), which states that a licensee shall keep surveillance recordings for a minimum of 30 calendar days, unless requested otherwise by the agency.

COUNT 8

Respondent's actions described above demonstrate a violation of Rule 420.209(12), which states that surveillance recordings of the licensee are subject to inspection by the Agency and must be kept in a manner that allows the Agency to view and obtain copies immediately upon request. The licensee must also be able to send the videos upon request.

COUNT 9

Respondent's actions described above demonstrate a violation of Rule 420.303a(1), which states that a producer shall give a marijuana product a new package tag anytime the product changes form or is incorporated into a different product.

COUNT 10

Respondent's actions described above demonstrate a violation of Rule 420.304(2)(f), which states that the laboratory must have access to the entire batch for purposes of sampling.

COUNT 11

Respondent's actions described above demonstrate a violation of Rule 420.502(1), which states that each marijuana product sold or transferred must be clearly labeled with tracking identification numbers assigned by Metrc that are affixed, tagged, or labeled and recorded, and any other information required by the agency, the acts, and the rules.

THEREFORE, based on the above, the CRA gives notice of its intent to impose fines and/or other sanctions against Respondent's license, which may include suspension, revocation, restriction, and/or refusal to renew Respondent's license.

Under MCL 333.27957(1)(c) and Rule 420.704(2), any party aggrieved by an action of the CRA suspending, revoking, restricting, or refusing to renew a license, or imposing a fine, shall be given a hearing upon request. A request for a hearing must be submitted to the CRA in writing within 21 days after service of this complaint. Notice served by certified mail is considered complete on the business day following the date of the mailing.

Respondent also has the right to request a compliance conference under Rule 420.704(1) and R 420.808(4). A compliance conference is an informal meeting at which Respondent has the opportunity to discuss the allegations in this complaint and demonstrate compliance under the MRTMA and/or the administrative rules.

Hearing and compliance conference requests must be submitted in writing by one of the following methods, with a copy provided to the assistant attorneys general named below:

By Mail:	Department of Licensing & Regulatory Affairs Cannabis Regulatory Agency P.O. Box 30205 Lansing, Michigan 48909
In Person:	Department of Licensing & Regulatory Affairs Cannabis Regulatory Agency 2407 North Grand River Lansing, Michigan 48906
By Email:	CRA-LegalHearings@michigan.gov

If Respondent fails to timely respond to this formal complaint, a contested case hearing will be scheduled to resolve this matter.

Questions about this complaint should be directed to the undersigned assistant attorneys general.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ *Sarah E. Huyser*

Sarah E. Huyser (70500)
Assistant Attorney General
Attorney for Cannabis Regulatory Agency
Licensing and Regulation Division
525 West Ottawa Street
P.O. Box 30758
Lansing, Michigan 48909
Telephone: (517) 335-7569
Fax: (517) 241-1997

Dated: October 30, 2026

LF: 2026-0466714-A / Misspres dba Bag N Tag, AU-P-000610, ENF 26-00755 / formal complaint / 2026-10-30