STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF CLAIMS

JANE DOE 1, JANE DOE 3, and JANE DOE 5–11,

Plaintiffs,

v

Case No. 25-000155-MZ

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN and THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,

Hon. Randy J. Wallace

Defendants.
_____ /

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFFS' 9/16/26 MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

On April 7, 2026, defendants moved for summary disposition. On April 21, 2026, plaintiffs filed an amended complaint. On April 23, 2026, this Court's predecessor, Judge YATES, rejected the amended complaint, noting in his order that the ruling was without prejudice to plaintiffs' ability to move for leave to amend the complaint. Plaintiffs did not respond to the motion for summary disposition or move for leave to amend the complaint. Therefore, the motion for summary disposition was uncontested under Court of Claims LCR 2.119(C)(3). Approximately four months after the amended complaint was rejected, on August 26, 2026, this Court issued an opinion and order that granted defendants' uncontested motion for summary disposition. On September 16, 2026, plaintiffs moved for reconsideration of that opinion and order, raising arguments that could have been raised in a timely brief in opposition to summary disposition and a motion for leave to amend the complaint.

Upon review of the motion, it is DENIED. The Court declines to consider the legal theories raised for the first time in the motion for reconsideration. See *Yoost v Caspari*, 295 Mich App 209, 220; 813 NW2d 783 (2012). Plaintiffs have otherwise failed to demonstrate a palpable error by which the Court and the parties have been misled. See Court of Claims LCR 2.119(F)(3).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: September 18, 2026

Hon. Randy J. Wallace
Judge, Court of Claims