STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF CLAIMS

NORTHCARE NETWORK MENTAL HEALTH CARE ENTITY, NORTHERN MICHIGAN REGIONAL ENTITY, COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH PARTNERSHIP OF SOUTHEAST MICHIGAN, and REGION 10 PIHP,

Plaintiffs,

v

Case No. 24-000198-MZ

Hon. Sima G. Patel

STATE OF MICHIGAN, MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, and ELIZABETH HERTEL, in her official capacity,

Defendants.
_____ /

ORDER RE: PLAINTIFFS' 5/19/26 CORRECTED MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND CLARIFICATION OF 4/29/26 OPINION AND ORDER AND DEFENDANTS' 6/2/26 MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER STAYING DISCOVERY

On April 29, 2026, this Court issued an opinion and order that granted in part and denied in part defendants' motion for summary disposition. On May 19, 2026, plaintiff moved for reconsideration and clarification of this Court's April 29, 2026 opinion and order. Plaintiff filed a corrected motion for reconsideration on the same day. On May 20, 2026, this Court ordered defendants to respond to the motion for reconsideration, and defendants did so on June 2, 2026. Also on June 2, 2026, defendants moved for a protective order staying discovery pending the resolution of the motion for reconsideration and anticipated application for leave to appeal.

Having reviewed the briefing, the Court GRANTS IN PART plaintiffs' request for clarification to address the parties' confusion on whether the Court's analysis treated the terms "regional entity" and "PIHP" as synonymous. The Court will issue an amended opinion and order corresponding with this Order, which changes the word "PIHPs" on page 18, first full paragraph, lines four and seven, to "regional-entity PIHPs" to clarify the Court's original intended meaning. Because this clerical change does not affect the Court's analysis or ruling, the Court DENIES the motion for reconsideration for failure to demonstrate a palpable error by which the Court and the parties have been misled. Court of Claims LCR 2.119(F)(3). The Court DENIES plaintiffs' request for clarification on the scope of the Court's partial dismissal of Counts I-II because the Court finds that clarification is unnecessary.

The Court DENIES defendants' motion for a protective order staying discovery. Denial is without prejudice to either party filing a motion for stay in the Court of Appeals should an application for leave to appeal be filed.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: June 3, 2026

Sima G. Patel
Judge, Court of Claims