Court of Appeals, State of Michigan

ORDER

IN RE BURGESS

Docket No. 380623

LC No. 00-000000

Allie Greenleaf Maldonado
Presiding Judge

Christopher M. Trebilcock

Mariam S. Bazzi
Judges

The motion to waive fees is GRANTED for this case only.

The complaint for superintending control is DENIED. We further note the following. Plaintiff has a lengthy history of filings in this Court. This includes several recent matters that were dismissed for lack of jurisdiction (Docket Nos. 377523, 378449, 377485, and 378653); others dismissed for failure to comply with the Court Rules (Docket Nos. 379101 and 379289), and several others denied for lack of merit (Docket Nos. 377608, 377185, 379383). Plaintiff currently has other pending matters in this Court that were opened despite being defective, and in which defects remain uncured (Docket Nos. 379505 and 380348). And, in the days before filing the present complaint, plaintiff made multiple attempted filings with this Court that were rejected because they did not conform to the Court Rules in various respects. This Court explained the reasons for the rejections, and when plaintiff continued to file nonconforming pleadings, sent a detailed letter to plaintiff explaining why his pleadings were being rejected, explaining what is required by the Court Rules, directing him to the relevant rules, and also explaining where to find this Court's manuals for those proceeding without attorneys in this Court. Despite all of this, plaintiff still filed this complaint but did not file a supporting brief conforming to MCR 7.212(C), as is required by MCR 7.206(D). This Court nonetheless elected to open this matter, as well as another complaint for superintending control filed by plaintiff on Friday, May 8, 2026, which also did not include a brief in support as required by the Court Rules. At this point, plaintiff has demonstrated a continued pattern in this Court of filing pleadings that do not conform to the Court Rules and refusing to correct his deficiencies despite repeated notice from this Court as to what is required. Plaintiff also has a demonstrable history of filing meritless appeals and original actions. While we decline to take the step today, we caution plaintiff that continuing with such filings may lead to this Court concluding in the future that he is a vexatious litigator and imposing filing restrictions or other sanctions pursuant to MCR 7.216(C).

Presiding Judge

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

May 11, 2026
Date

Chief Clerk