Court of Appeals, State of Michigan

ORDER

IN RE WAGNER

Docket No. 379286

LC No. 24-121623-CH

Thomas C. Cameron
Presiding Judge

Mark T. Boonstra

James Robert Redford
Judges

Although plaintiff framed her filing as a complaint for a writ of mandamus and superintending control, it is properly considered solely as a complaint for superintending control. See MCR 3.302(C) ("A superintending control order replaces . . . the writ of mandamus when directed to a lower court[.]"); see also *People v Johnson*, 345 Mich App 51, 59; 3 NW3d 846 (2022) (interpreting an improperly labeled complaint for mandamus as an action for superintending control). So considered, the complaint for superintending control is DENIED. The motion for peremptory relief is also DENIED.



Presiding Judge

A true copy entered and certified by Jerome W. Zimmer Jr., Chief Clerk, on

July 29, 2026
Date



Chief Clerk