STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF CLAIMS

MICHIGAN SENATE and MICHIGAN SENATE MAJORITY LEADER WINNIE BRINKS, in her official capacity,

Plaintiffs,

v

Case No. 25-000014-MB

Hon. Sima G. Patel

MICHIGAN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MICHIGAN HOUSE SPEAKER MATT HALL, in his official capacity, and MICHIGAN HOUSE CLERK SCOTT STARR, in his official capacity,

Defendants.
_____ /

AMENDED ORDER DISMISSING COMPLAINT AS MOOT

On August 3, 2026, the Court entered an order dismissing plaintiffs' complaint as moot. On August 12, 2026, defendants requested the Court enter an amended order of dismissal based on an inaccurate factual statement in the order. The Court GRANTS the motion and enters the following amended order:

On February 3, 2025, plaintiffs filed suit seeking to compel defendants to present nine bills that had been approved by both houses of the Legislature to the Governor. On February 27, 2025, this Court entered a declaratory judgment that defendants were required by Const 1963, art 4, § 33 to present the bills to the Governor, but finding no ground to enforce that duty. Plaintiffs appealed and defendants filed a cross appeal. The Court of Appeals affirmed this Court's decision on the merits, but, in a split opinion, concluded that the Court could compel defendants' action in this

regard. The Court of Appeals remanded to this Court for entry of a writ of mandamus compelling defendants to present the nine bills to the Governor. Defendants filed an application for leave to appeal to the Michigan Supreme Court. The Supreme Court heard oral argument on the application, but on July 10, 2026, denied the application for leave to appeal.

This Court was then required to wait 21 days before implementing the Court of Appeals order on remand. See MCR 7.315(C). However, following the Supreme Court's order, the Clerk of the House of Representatives "announced the enrollment printing and presentation" of the nine bills to the Governor. 2024 House Journal Addenda 2135. The Governor then vetoed the nine bills. *Id.* The House's presentation of the bills and the Governor's subsequent veto has rendered MOOT plaintiffs' petition for a writ of mandamus.

Accordingly, the Court DISMISSES plaintiffs' complaint as MOOT. This is a final order resolving all issues in this case.

Date: August 13, 2026

Sima G. Patel
Judge, Court of Claims