

STATE OF MICHIGAN
SIXTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT

MICHAEL LEWIS BUTZ,

Plaintiff,

vs.

Case No. 23-2852-CZ

JENNIFER ZELMANSKI, Clerk of the City of Roseville
and the CITY OF ROSEVILLE, a Michigan Municipal
Corporation,

Defendants,

and

JOCELYN BENSON, Secretary of State,

Intervening Defendant,

CONSOLIDATED WITH

MICHAEL LEWIS BUTZ,

Plaintiff,

vs.

CATHY LaFONTAINE, Clerk of the Township of Richmond
and the TOWNSHIP OF RICHMOND, a Michigan Municipal
Corporation,

Case No. 23-2835-CZ

and

SUSAN KRAFT, Clerk of the Township of Bruce and the
TOWNSHIP OF BRUCE, a Michigan Municipal Corporation,

Case Nos. 23-2836-CZ
23-2839-CZ

and

KRISTI POZZI, Clerk of the Township of Macomb and the
TOWNSHIP OF MACOMB, a Michigan Municipal Corporation,

Case No. 23-2837-CZ

and

LAURA KROPP, Mayor of the City of Mount Clemens,
CATHLEEN MARTIN, Clerk of the City of Mount Clemens,
and the CITY OF MOUNT CLEMENS, a Michigan Municipal
Corporation, Case No. 23-2838-CZ

and

JANICE POCKRANDT, Deputy Clerk of the City of Centerline
and the CITY OF CENTERLINE, a Michigan Municipal
Corporation, Case No. 23-2840-CZ

and

STANLEY GROT, Clerk of the Township of Shelby, LISA SUIDA
FOIA Coordinator of the Township of Shelby, and the TOWNSHIP
OF SHELBY, a Michigan Municipal Corporation, Case No. 23-2841-CZ

and

STANLEY BABINSKI, Clerk of the Township of Washington
and the TOWNSHIP OF WASHINGTON, a Michigan Municipal
Corporation, Case No. 23-2842-CZ

and

ADAM WIT, Clerk of the Township of Harrison, TERI SALGOT,
Deputy Clerk of the Township of Harrison, and the TOWNSHIP
OF HARRISON, a Michigan Municipal Corporation, Case No. 23-2843-CZ

and

AMY ANIKEWICH, Deputy Clerk/FOIA Coordinator Designee
of the City of Saint Clair Shores and the CITY OF SAINT CLAIR
SHORES, a Michigan Municipal Corporation, Case No. 23-2844-CZ

and

ROBIN UNDERWOOD, Deputy Clerk of the City of Eastpointe,
OTIS D. GATSON, FOIA Coordinator of the City of Eastpointe,
and the CITY OF EASTPOINTE, a Michigan Municipal
Corporation, Case No. 23-2845-CZ

and

SONJA BUFFA, Clerk of the City of Warren and the CITY OF
WARREN, a Michigan Municipal Corporation, Case No. 23-2847-CZ

and

KIM MELTZER, Clerk of the Township of Clinton and the
TOWNSHIP OF CLINTON, a Michigan Municipal Corporation,

Case No. 23-2848-CZ

and

MELANIE RYSKA, Clerk of the City of Sterling Heights and the
CITY OF STERLING HEIGHTS, a Michigan Municipal Corporation,

Case No. 23-2850-CZ

and

CINDY BERRY, Clerk of the Township of Chesterfield,
MICHELLE NIZZA, Deputy Clerk/FOIA Coordinator of
the Township of CHESTERFIELD, and the TOWNSHIP OF
CHESTERFIELD, a Michigan Municipal Corporation,

Case No. 23-2851-CZ

Defendants.

OPINION AND ORDER

Intervening defendant Jocelyn Benson, Secretary of State (“SOS”) has filed a motion for summary disposition pursuant to MCR 2.116(C)(10). Further, the following defendants have each filed motions for summary disposition pursuant to MCR 2.116(C)(10): Robin Underwood, Otis D. Gatson, and the City of Eastpointe (collectively “City of Eastpointe”); Amy Anikewich and the City of Saint Clair Shores (collectively “City of Saint Clair Shores”); Susan Kraft and the Township of Bruce (collectively “Bruce Township”); and Stanley Babinski and the Township of Washington (collectively “Washington Township”). Defendants Jennifer Zelmanski and the City of Roseville (collectively “City of Roseville”) have filed a motion for summary disposition and concurrence and joinder in the SOS and City of Saint Clair Shores’ motions for summary disposition. Defendants Sonja Buffa and the City of Warren (collectively “City of Warren”) have filed a motion for summary disposition and concurrence and joinder in the SOS, City of Saint Clair Shores, and City of Roseville’s motions for summary disposition. Defendants Cindy Berry, Michael Nizza, and the Township of Chesterfield (collectively “Chesterfield Township”) have

filed a concurrence and joinder in the SOS's motion and all other co-defendants' motions for summary disposition. Defendants Janice Pockrandt and the City of Centerline (collectively "City of Centerline") and defendants Kristi Pozzi and the Township of Macomb (collectively "Macomb Township") have filed a motion for summary disposition and concurrence and joinder in the SOS and City of Saint Clair Shores' motions for summary disposition. Defendants Melanie Ryska and the City of Sterling Heights (collectively "City of Sterling Heights") and defendants Cathy LaFontaine and the Township of Richmond (collectively "Richmond Township") have filed a joinder and concurrence with the SOS and City of Saint Clair Shores' motions for summary disposition and a request for summary disposition pursuant to MCR 2.116(I)(1). Plaintiff Michael Lewis Butz ("Plaintiff") has filed a joint brief in response to the motions.

Factual and Procedural History

In this case, Plaintiff sent Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA") requests to each city and township defendant seeking data files from the electronic poll books ("EPB") for the elections concluding on November 8, 2022 and May 2, 2023 with the proper redactions. Plaintiff requested the data files to be in either comma separated electronic version (.CSV) format or Microsoft Excel workbook (.XLS) format. Each defendant denied Plaintiff's FOIA requests. Plaintiff claims that the information he sought must be open for public inspection. Plaintiff also sent a FOIA request to the Bureau of Elections seeking EPB history for all jurisdictions in Macomb County for the November 2022 and May 2023 elections. *See* SOS's Exhibit 2, May 13, 2023 FOIA request. On September 6, 2023, the Bureau of Elections provided records in .XLS format to Plaintiff. *See* SOS's Exhibit 3, September 6, 2023 FOIA Notice.

Plaintiff has filed complaints against each city and township defendant claiming violation of the FOIA and violation of Federal and State laws. On October 2, 2023, the Court entered an Order of Consolidation consolidating the cases filed by Plaintiff with case number 23-2852-CZ.

On November 20, 2023, the Court entered an Order granting the SOS's motion to intervene as a party defendant. On March 11, 2024, Plaintiff filed a supplemental brief arguing that he is entitled to the records requested from each city and township defendant and that none of the records are exempt from disclosure. On March 20, 2023, Plaintiff filed an amended supplemental brief.

The SOS, City of Roseville, Richmond Township, Bruce Township, Macomb Township, City of Centerline, Washington Township, City of Saint Clair Shores, City of Eastpointe, City of Warren, City of Sterling Heights, and Chesterfield Township have moved for summary disposition of Plaintiff's claims. On May 6, 2024, Plaintiff filed a joint brief in response to the motions. The SOS, City of Saint Clair Shores, City of Eastpointe, and City of Roseville have filed supplemental briefs. Defendants Laura Kropp, Cathleen Martin, and the City of Mount Clemens (collectively "City of Mount Clemens"); Stanley Grot, Lisa Suida, and the Township of Shelby (collectively "Shelby Township"); and Kim Meltzer and the Township of Clinton (collectively "Clinton Township") have each filed a concurrence and joinder in the SOS, City of Saint Clair Shores, and City of Eastpointe's reply briefs. The Court held a hearing in connections with the motions and took the matter under advisement.

Standard of Review

A motion under MCR 2.116(C)(10) tests the factual support of a claim. *Maiden v Rozwood*, 461 Mich 109, 120; 597 NW2d 817 (1999). In reviewing such a motion, a trial court considers affidavits, pleadings, depositions, admissions, and other evidence submitted by the parties in the light most favorable to the party opposing the motion. *Id.* Where the proffered evidence fails to establish a genuine issue regarding any material fact, the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. *Id.* "A genuine issue of material fact exists when the record leaves open an issue upon which reasonable minds could differ. *Debano-Griffin v Lake Co*, 493 Mich 167, 175; 828 NW2d 634 (2013).

Arguments

The SOS and the city and township defendants argue that the SOS had authority to instruct the city and township defendants to deny Plaintiff's FOIA requests and refer Plaintiff to the Bureau of Elections to obtain the requested records. The city and township defendants also argue that they properly denied Plaintiff's requests based on the instructions provided by the SOS. Next, the SOS and the city and township defendants argue that Plaintiff's claim is moot because Plaintiff received all records on September 6, 2023 from the Bureau of Elections. Lastly, the SOS and the city and township defendants contend that Plaintiff's alleged violations of 52 US 20701, MCL 750.492, and MCL 750.248 must be dismissed because they do not provide for a civil cause of action.

In response, Plaintiff asserts that the SOS is unable to provide guidance to the city and township defendants and the city and township defendants improperly relied on the guidance and advice of the SOS. Plaintiff also argues that the production of records from the Bureau of Elections is insufficient because each defendant must respond to his FOIA requests and produce the publicly disclosable information. Plaintiff asserts that each city and township defendant have the ability to provide properly redacted documents per his request. Finally, Plaintiff also argues that the claimed exemptions to not apply.

Law and Analysis

Pursuant to MCL 168.735(1), "[a]t each primary and election, election inspectors shall keep 1 poll book and 1 poll list. An election inspector shall enter in the poll book, in the order in which electors are given ballots, the name of each elector who is given a ballot and immediately after the name, on the same line, shall enter the number of the ballot given to the elector. For an absent voter ballot, when an election supervisor removed the ballot from the seal absent voter envelope, the election inspector shall enter in the poll book the name of the absent voter and the number of the ballot."

MCL 168.668b provides the election law regarding EPB software and provides that “[e]ach city or township shall use the electronic poll book software developed, acquired, or approved by the bureau of elections in each election precinct in the city or township on election day to process voters and general election precinct reports.” MCL 168.668b(1). Per MCL 168.509gg(1) and (2), the following is exempt from disclosure: the record that an individual declined to register to vote, the office that received a registered elector’s application, a registered elector’s driver license or state personal identification card number, the month and day of birth of a registered elector, the telephone number provided by a registered elector, the digitized signature of an elector, and, except as otherwise provided, the last 4 digits of a registered elector’s Social Security number.

Further, MCL 168.509m-MCL 168.509ii sets forth laws regarding the State of Michigan’s implementation of use of a statewide qualified voter file (“QVF”). The purpose of the statutes includes establishing “a statewide qualified voter file that consists of all qualified electors who wish to be registered to vote in local, state, and federal elections.” MCL 168.509m(1)(a). “The secretary of state shall direct and supervise the establishment and maintenance of a statewide [QVF]. The [QVF] is the official file for the conduct of all elections held in this state.” MCL 168.509o(1). Per MCL 168.509r(1), “[t]he secretary of state shall establish and maintain the computer system and programs necessary to the operation of the [QVF]. The secretary of state shall allow each county, city, or township access to the [QVF].”

The FOIA states that “[i]t is the public policy of this state that all persons...are entitled to full and complete information regarding the affairs of government and the official acts of those who represent them as public officials and public employees, consistent with this act.” MCL 15.231(2). “Except as expressly provided in section 13, upon providing a public body’s FOIA coordinator with a written request that describes a public record sufficiently to enable the public body to find the public record, a person has a right to inspect, copy, or receive copies of the

requested public record of the public body.” MCL 15.233(1). “If a public body makes a final determination to deny all or a portion of a request, the requesting person may...[c]ommence a civil action in the circuit court...to compel the public body’s disclosure of the public records...” MCL 15.240(1)(b).

Section 13 of the FOIA, MCL 15.243(1), states, in pertinent part, that a public body may exempt from disclosure as a public record under this act any of the following:

(y) Records or information of measures designated to protect the security or safety of persons or property, or the confidentiality, integrity, or availability of information systems, whether public or private, including, but not limited to, building, public works, and public water designs to the extent that those designs relate to the ongoing security measures of a public body, capabilities and plans for responding to a violation of the Michigan anti-terrorism act,...MCL 750.543a to 750.543z, emergency response plans, risk planning documents, threat assessments, domestic preparedness strategies, and cybersecurity plans, assessments, or vulnerabilities, unless disclosure would not impair a public body’s ability to protect the security or safety of persons or property or unless the public interest in disclosure outweighs the public interest in nondisclosure in the particular instance.

(z) Information that would identify or provide a means of identifying a person that may, as a result of disclosure of the information, become a victim of cybersecurity incident or that would disclose a person’s cybersecurity plans or cybersecurity-related practices, procedures, methods, results, organizational information system infrastructure, hardware, or software.

SOS Authority to Issue Directives

The SOS and the city and township defendants contend that the SOS properly issued directives to the city and township defendants directing them to deny Plaintiff’s FOIA requests and to direct Plaintiff to the Bureau of Elections to obtain the requested documents. In response, Plaintiff asserts that the SOS did not have the authority to instruct the city and township defendants to deny his requests and the city and township defendants are not able to rely on the response of another entity or agency to deny a FOIA request.

On November 14, 2022, Lori Bourbonais, Director of the Election Administration Division, sent an email to the defendant city and township clerks notifying the clerks of the

exemptions and directing the clerks to consult with their city or township attorney regarding FOIA requests for the QVF and EPBs. *See* SOS's Exhibit 4, Attachment C, November 14, 2022 email. On July 10, 2023, Jonathan Brater, the Director of Elections, sent out a memorandum outlining issues with FOIA requests for QVF and EPB records and instructing that requestors can be directed to the court clerk for paper pollbook copies or to the Bureau of Election for the log file or voter history. *See* SOS's Exhibit 4, Attachment D, July 10, 2023 Memorandum.

In support of their position, the SOS and the city and township defendants first contend that the SOS has supervisory authority over all clerks in the performance of their election duties. *See* MCL 168.21 (stating "The secretary of state shall be the chief election officer of the state and shall have supervisory control over local election officials in the performance of their duties under the provisions of [the Michigan Election Law act]"); *see also* MCL 168.31(1)(b) (stating that the secretary of state shall "advise and direct local election officials as to the proper methods of conducting elections.")

The SOS and the city and township defendants also rely on Opinion No. 7247 from the Attorney General stating "[t]he Secretary of State, in her role as the Chief Elections Officer, or the Director of Elections through the authority vested in that office, may exercise supervisory authority over local elections officials responding to a [FOIA] request for voted ballots by issuing directions for the review of ballots in order to protect their physical integrity and the security of voted ballots." *See* City of Eastpointe's Exhibit E, Opinion No. 7247. Lastly, the SOS and the city and township defendants also contend that the QVF is a creation of the Department of State and its programming and contents belong to the state. *See* MCL 168.509m, MCL 168.509o, and MCL 168.509r. The SOS and the city and township defendants maintain that the SOS has supervisory authority over the software and data downloaded from the QVF to the EPBs and the subsequent upload of data from the EPBs to the QVF. *See* MCL 168.668b(1).

In response, Plaintiff relies on *American Civil Liberties Union (“ACLU”) of Mich v Calhoun Co Sherriff’s Office*, 509 Mich 1; 983 NW2d 300 (2022). *ACLU of Mich* involved a request for documents under FOIA related to the December 2018 detention of a United States citizen. *Id.* at 4. The request was denied citing to the exemption found in MCL 15.243(1)(d), which provides that “[a] public body may exempt from disclosure...[r]ecords or information specifically described and exempted from disclosure by statute.” *Id.* The Calhoun County Sherriff’s Office argued that a federal regulation provided for the non-disclosure to qualify for the exemption under MCL 15.243(1)(d). *Id.* at 6. The *ACLU of Mich* Court found that MCL 15.243(1)(d) specifically states “by statute” and not “by statute or regulation.” *Id.* at 11. Thus, the *ACLU of Mich* Court found that “[a] regulation cannot serve as the basis for exempting from disclosure public records under MCL 15.243(1)(d).” *Id.* at 17.

Upon review of the authority provided, the Court finds that Department of State and the SOS had authority to provide guidance to local clerks regarding Plaintiff’s FOIA requests and to direct any FOIA requests seeking that information to the Bureau of Elections. While each defendant must have responded to Plaintiff’s FOIA request, Plaintiff fails to provide authority that the SOS was unable to provide guidance to the local clerks. Further, this case is differentiated from *ACLU of Mich* because Plaintiff’s FOIA request was not denied based on MCL 15.243(1)(d). Thus, the Court will address whether Plaintiff received the requested records and whether each city and township defendant was required to provide the requested records.

Records Provided to Plaintiff and Defendants’ Denials of Plaintiff’s FOIA Requests

The SOS and the city and township defendants do not dispute that the EPB voter history files contain information that is subject to disclosure under the FOIA. However, the SOS and the city and township defendants argue that Plaintiff received all records on September 6, 2023 from the Bureau of Elections. *See* SOS’s Exhibit 3, September 6, 2023 FOIA Notice; Exhibit 4, ¶28-

30, Affidavit of Mr. Brater. The city and township defendants also argue that they lawfully denied Plaintiff's FOIA requests pursuant to MCL 15.243(1)(y) and (z). In response, Plaintiff asserts that each city and township defendant must disclose all publicly disclosable information and redact all information that must be redacted.

In this case, Plaintiff requested the information in a .CVS or .XLS format. The SOS and the city and township defendants argue that local clerks do not have the capability of producing the EPB history in a .XLS format and the .CVS format unavoidably produces sensitive information relating to the software design and architecture, which is exempt under MCL 15.243(1)(y) and (z). See SOS's Exhibit 4, ¶25, Affidavit of Mr. Brater. The SOS and the city and township defendants contend that the .CVS files also contain information that is not subject to disclosure that the local clerks are unable to redact. *Id.* As a result, Plaintiff was directed to the county clerk for paper pollbook copies or to the Bureau of Elections, which can produce the EPB files in an .XLS format without the exempt information. See SOS's Exhibit 4, ¶26, 27, Affidavit of Mr. Brater; Exhibit 4, Attachment D, Department of State Memorandum.

In his affidavit, Mr. Brater states that the Department of State's production of EPB history information for all jurisdictions in Macomb County for the May 2023 election included all city and township defendants that held May 2023 elections, including City of Roseville, City of Centerline, City of Warren, City of Sterling Heights, Richmond Township, Bruce Township, Macomb Township, Shelby Township, Washington Township, and Clinton Township. See SOS's Exhibit 4, ¶30, Affidavit of Mr. Brater. Further, Mr. Brater stated that the Department of State produced the EPB history information for all city and township defendants for the November 2022 election. *Id.* ¶29.

In response, Plaintiff asserts that each city and township defendant can provide the information requested in his FOIA requests without disclosing redactable or protected software

information. In support of his argument, Plaintiff presents an alleged response to a FOIA request from the City of Memphis. See Plaintiff's Exhibit 2, alleged Memphis disclosure. Plaintiff argues that Memphis was able to redact all sensitive information. See *Id.* However, the SOS presents an affidavit of Mr. Brater stating that the Memphis records provided by Plaintiff contain proprietary software information, security feature information, and other sensitive information that is exempt under MCL 15.243(y) and/or (z). See SOS's reply brief, Exhibit 9, Affidavit of Mr. Brater.

Plaintiff also argues that questions of fact remain as to whether the records provided by the Bureau of Elections are the same as those in the possession of each city and township defendant. Plaintiff relies on an affidavit of Stephanie Scott, former Adams Township Clerk. See Plaintiff's Exhibit 1, Plaintiff's Supplemental Brief, Attachment C, Affidavit of Ms. Scott. In her affidavit, Ms. Scott states that she did not delete EPB data as directed and instead had the data analyzed by a forensic expert. *Id.* She states that she learned "that the EPB data is original evidence that has information not contained elsewhere..." *Id.* She states that she discovered discrepancies between the EPB data and the records obtained from the Bureau of Elections. *Id.*

Here, it is undisputed that each defendant provided a denial of Plaintiff's FOIA requests citing to MCL 15.243(y) and (z). See Plaintiff's response, p. 11. Additionally, there is no evidence that each city and township defendant could produce the requested records in the formats requested by Plaintiff without disclosing exempt information or the software design of the EPBs. While Plaintiff presents an alleged response to a FOIA request from Memphis Township, Plaintiff fails to establish that he obtained the records in response to a FOIA request or that the records did not disclose exempt information or software design. Further, Mr. Brater states in his affidavit that the documents allegedly produced by Memphis contain exempt information. See SOS's reply brief, Exhibit 9, Affidavit of Mr. Brater.

Next, while Plaintiff presents the affidavit of Ms. Scott as alleged evidence that the information provided by the Bureau of Elections may not match records in the possession of the city and township defendants, Plaintiff fails to cite to where the records allegedly differ or establish that any difference is not due solely to the format in which the records were produced. Thus, Plaintiff fails to establish that the records received from the Bureau of Elections is an inadequate response to his FOIA requests. Accordingly, the Court finds that the city and township defendants each specifically denied Plaintiff's FOIA requests and Plaintiff has received all public requested information, making Plaintiff's FOIA requests to compel the records moot. See *Herald Co, Inc v Ann Arbor Pub Sch*, 224 Mich App 266, 270-271; 568 NW2d 411 (1997) ("When the disclosure that a suit seeks has already been made, the substance of the controversy disappears and becomes moot.") Accordingly, the Court grants the SOS and the city and township defendants' motion for summary disposition of Plaintiff's claims to compel the city and township defendants to produce the records requested in his FOIA requests.

Violations of 52 USC 20701, MCL 750.492, and MCL 750.248

The SOS and the city and township defendants allege that 52 USC 20701, MCL 750.492, and MCL 750.248 are criminal statutes and cannot be brought as a private cause of action. In response, Plaintiff asserts that he has properly brought these claims against the city and township defendants.

52 USC 20701 states, in pertinent part:

Every officer of election shall retain and preserve, for a period of twenty-two months from the date of any general, special or primary election of which candidates for the office of President, Vice President, presidential elector, Member of the Senate, Member of the House of Representatives, or Resident Commissioner from the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are voted for, all records and papers which come into his possession relating to the application, registration, payment of poll tax, or other act requisite to voting in such election...Any officer of election or custodian who willfully fails to comply with this section shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

52 USC 20702 states that “[a]ny person, whether or not an officer of election or custodian, who willfully steals, destroys, conceals, mutilates, or alters any record or paper required by section 20701 of this title to be retained and preserved shall be fined not more than \$1,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.”

MCL 750.492 of the Michigan Penal Code states, in pertinent part:

Any officer having the custody of any county, city, or township records in this state who shall when requested fail or neglect to furnish proper and reasonable facilities for the inspection and examination of the records and files in his or her office and for making memoranda of transcripts therefrom during the usual business hours, which shall not be less than 4 hours per day, to any person having occasion to make examination of them for any lawful purpose is guilty of a misdemeanor punishable for not more than 1 year or a fine of not more than \$1,000.

MCL 750.248(1) of the Michigan Penal Code states, in pertinent part:

A person who falsely makes, alters, forges, or counterfeits a public record...with intent to injure or defraud another person is guilty of a felony punishable by imprisonment for not more than 14 years.

52 USC 20701 and 20702 “do not provide private causes of action.” *Smith v DeBoyer*, opinion of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, issued October 12, 2022 (Case No. 2:22-cv-11572), p. 3. Further, generally where a statute contains criminal penalties for violations of its provisions, it has been held that no private cause of action based on alleged violations of the statute will lie. See *Lane v KinderCare Learning Ctrs, Inc*, 231 Mich App 689; 695-696; 588 NW2d 715 (1998). Plaintiff fails to present any arguments or authority that he can bring a private cause of action for violations of 52 USC 20701, MCL 750.492, or MCL 750.248. Accordingly, the Court grants the SOS and the city and township defendants’ motions for summary disposition of Plaintiff’s claims of violation of 52 USC 20701, MCL 750.492, MCL 750.248.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, the SOS and the city and township defendants' motions for summary disposition are GRANTED. Pursuant to MCR 2.602(A)(3), this Opinion and Order resolves the last pending claim and CLOSES the case.

IT IS SO ORDERED.


EDWARD A. SERVITTO, JR., Circuit Court Judge

Date:

6/25/2024

cc: Stephanie Lambert, Attorney for Plaintiff
Heather S. Meingast, Attorney for Intervenor-Defendant Secretary of State Jocelyn Benson
Timothy Tomlinson, Attorney for Defendants Zelmanski and City of Roseville
Marc D. Kaszubski and Nathan Petrusak, Attorneys for City of Sterling Heights and
Melanie Ryska
Michael J. Murray, Attorney for the City of Mount Clemens, Laura Kropp and Cathleen
Martin
Marianne J. Grano, Attorney for the City of Centerline and Janie Pockrandt
James E. Tamm and Kevin A. McQuillian, Attorneys for Macomb Township and Kristi
Pozzi
Robert J. Seibert, Attorney for Washington Township and Stanley Babinski
Ethan Vinson and Laura Sullivan, Attorneys for the City of Warren and Sonja Buffa
John A. Dolan, Attorney for Clinton Township and Kim Meltzer
Thomas D. Landa, Attorney for Chesterfield Township, Cindy Berry and Michelle Nizza
Robert S. Huth, Attorney for Shelby Township, Stanley Grot, Lisa Suida, Harrison
Township, Adam Wit and Teri Salgto
Timothy S. Ferrand and Jennifer Lynn Burnett, Attorneys for City of St. Clair Shores, Amy
Anikewich, City of Eastpointe and Otis D. Gatson
Sharon DeWaele, Attorney for Richmond Township and Cathy Lafontaine

