STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF CLAIMS

FELICIA LIPSCOMB,

Plaintiff,

v Case No. 26-000060-MZ

TROOPER CHADWICK CARPENTER, Hon. Michael F. Gadola

Defendant.
_____ /

OPINION AND ORDER GRANTING SUMMARY DISPOSITION TO DEFENDANT

On February 17, 2026, plaintiff filed an affidavit and claim, *in propria persona*, in 36th District Court against Michigan State Police (MSP) Trooper Chadwick Carpenter. Defendant removed the case from the small claims division to the general civil division of the district court and subsequently transferred the claim to this Court under MCL 600.6404(3) on March 27, 2026.

Plaintiff's affidavit and claim[1] (the claim) states that her claim arose from a May 16, 2023, car accident between plaintiff's vehicle and another vehicle. Plaintiff alleges that defendant ticketed her "without good cause because I was not at fault." She alleges that she filed a complaint with defendant's supervisor and that the traffic report was amended in January 2026. She alleges that she was "harassed/retaliated against/incurred unnecessary costs/driver's record

[1] Plaintiff attached to her claim 59 pages of handwritten notes that are chaotic and largely indecipherable.

target/lic[ense] suspended which was improper basis on a non-conviction suspension. I've been errored, discriminated against and rights violated. I'm seeking the overturn of such malicious suspension of my driver's license, costs awarded, exemplary and punitive damages."

On April 14, 2026, defendant moved for summary disposition under MCR 2.116(C)(7) and (8) and provided this Court with proof that the motion was mailed to plaintiff by first-class mail on April 15, 2026. Under Court of Claims LCR 2.119(C)(2), plaintiff had 14 days—or until April 29, 2026—to respond to the motion. Plaintiff has failed to respond to the motion and, therefore, the motion is treated as uncontested. Court of Claims LCR 2.119(C)(3).

A motion for summary disposition under MCR 2.116(C)(7) allows for summary disposition when a claim is barred because of immunity granted by law. To avoid dismissal because of governmental immunity, a plaintiff must plead a claim in avoidance of governmental immunity. *Mack v Detroit*, 467 Mich 186, 198; 649 NW2d 47 (2002).

"A motion under MCR 2.116(C)(8) tests the *legal sufficiency* of a claim on the basis of the factual allegations in the complaint." *El-Khalil v Oakwood Healthcare, Inc*, 504 Mich 152, 159; 934 NW2d 665 (2019). "All well-pleaded factual allegations are accepted as true and construed in a light most favorable to the nonmovant." *Maiden v Rozwood*, 461 Mich 109, 119; 597 NW2d 817 (1999). "However, the mere statement of a pleader's conclusions, unsupported by allegations of fact, will not suffice to state a cause of action." *Black v Cook*, 346 Mich App 121, 129; 11 NW3d 563 (2023) (quotation marks and citation omitted).

Defendant's uncontested motion contends that plaintiff's claim fails to comply with the pleading requirements of MCR 2.111(A)(1) and (B)(1) and fails to state a claim on which relief can be granted. Michigan follows a notice-pleading standard that requires complaints to contain

specific factual allegations necessary to reasonably inform the defendant of the nature of the claims being asserted to permit the defendant to take a responsive position. *Baker v Marshall*, 323 Mich App 590, 595; 919 NW2d 407 (2018). The Michigan Court Rules contain requirements to file a lawsuit. "Each allegation of a pleading must be clear, concise, and direct." MCR 2.111(A)(1). A complaint must contain "[a] statement of the facts, without repetition, on which the pleader relies in stating the cause of action, with the specific allegations necessary reasonably to inform the adverse party of the nature of the claims the adverse party is called on to defend." MCR 2.111(B)(1). A party's status as a pro se litigant does not excuse the party from complying with procedural requirements in the court rules. *Bachor v City of Detroit*, 49 Mich App 507, 512; 212 NW2d 302 (1973).

Stating a cause of action without supporting allegations fails to meet the pleading requirements. The allegations in the claim allege only that defendant issued plaintiff a ticket without good cause because plaintiff was not at fault for the accident. The claim does not include sufficient factual allegations to reasonably inform defendant of the claims being asserted against him, fails to comply with the pleading requirements under MCR 2.111(B)(1), and does not state a claim for relief against defendant. For these reasons, the Court GRANTS summary disposition under MCR 2.116(C)(8) to defendant.

Defendant argues that even if plaintiff stated a claim for relief, he would be entitled to governmental immunity under the Government Tort Liability Act (GTLA), MCL 691.1401 *et seq*. The GTLA affords broad immunity from tort liability to governmental agencies and their employees whenever they are engaged in the exercise or discharge of a governmental function. *Beals v Michigan*, 497 Mich 363, 370; 871 NW2d 5 (2015). Under the GTLA, governmental actors are immune from liability for negligence-based torts if the following conditions are met: (1)

"the individual was acting or reasonably believed that he was acting within the scope of his authority," (2) "the governmental agency was engaged in the exercise or discharge of a governmental function," and (3) the individual's conduct does not amount to gross negligence that is the proximate cause of the injury or damage. *Odom v Wayne Co*, 482 Mich 459, 479-480; 760 NW2d 217 (2008); see also MCL 691.1407(2).

Plaintiff's claim establishes that defendant was acting within the scope of his authority as a trooper and was engaged in the discharge of a governmental function when issuing her a ticket. Plaintiff's claim does not allege that defendant engaged in grossly negligent conduct that proximately caused plaintiff's injury or damage. Defendant is therefore entitled to governmental immunity under MCL 691.1407(2). The Court GRANTS summary disposition under MCR 2.116(C)(7) to defendant.

IT IS SO ORDERED. This is a final order that resolves the last pending claim and closes the case.

Date: May 18, 2026

Hon. Michael F. Gadola
Chief Judge, Court of Claims