

# Order

Michigan Supreme Court  
Lansing, Michigan

June 15, 2022

Bridget M. McCormack,  
Chief Justice

ADM File No. 2021-48

Proposed Amendment of  
Rule 6.502 of the Michigan  
Court Rules

---

Brian K. Zahra  
David F. Viviano  
Richard H. Bernstein  
Elizabeth T. Clement  
Megan K. Cavanagh  
Elizabeth M. Welch,  
Justices

On order of the Court, this is to advise that the Court is considering an amendment of Rule 6.502 of the Michigan Court Rules. Before determining whether the proposal should be adopted, changed before adoption, or rejected, this notice is given to afford interested persons the opportunity to comment on the form or the merits of the proposal or to suggest alternatives. The Court welcomes the views of all. This matter will also be considered at a public hearing. The notices and agendas for each public hearing are posted on the [Public Administrative Hearings](#) page.

Publication of this proposal does not mean that the Court will issue an order on the subject, nor does it imply probable adoption of the proposal in its present form.

[Additions to the text are indicated in underlining and  
deleted text is shown by strikeover.]

Rule 6.502 Motion for Relief from Judgment

(A)-(F) [Unchanged.]

(G) Successive Motions.

(1) [Unchanged.]

(2) A defendant may file a second or subsequent motion based on any of the following:

(a) ~~based on~~ a retroactive change in law that occurred after the first motion for relief from judgment was filed,

(b) ~~or~~ a claim of new evidence that was not discovered before the first such motion was filed, or

- (c) a final court order vacating one or more of the defendant’s convictions either described in the judgment from which the defendant is seeking relief or upon which the judgment was based.

The clerk shall refer a successive motion to the judge to whom the case is assigned for a determination whether the motion is within one of the exceptions.

The court may waive the provisions of this rule if it concludes that there is a significant possibility that the defendant is innocent of the crime. For motions filed under both (G)(1) and (G)(2), the court shall enter an appropriate order disposing of the motion.

- (3) [Unchanged.]

*Staff Comment:* The proposed amendment of MCR 6.502 would allow a third exception to the “one and only one motion” rule based on a final court order vacating one or more of a defendant’s convictions either described in the judgment or upon which the judgment was based.

The staff comment is not an authoritative construction by the Court. In addition, adoption of a new rule or amendment in no way reflects a substantive determination by this Court.

A copy of this order will be given to the Secretary of the State Bar and to the State Court Administrator so that they can make the notifications specified in MCR 1.201. Comments on the proposal may be submitted by October 1, 2022 by clicking on the “Comment on this Proposal” link under this proposal on the [Court’s Proposed & Adopted Orders on Administrative Matters](#) page. You may also submit a comment in writing at P.O. Box 30052, Lansing, MI 48909 or via email at [ADMcomment@courts.mi.gov](mailto:ADMcomment@courts.mi.gov). When filing a comment, please refer to ADM File No. 2021-48. Your comments and the comments of others will be posted under the chapter affected by this proposal.



I, Larry S. Royster, Clerk of the Michigan Supreme Court, certify that the foregoing is a true and complete copy of the order entered at the direction of the Court.

June 15, 2022

Clerk