STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF CLAIMS

MUTAZ ALSHARA,

Plaintiff,

v

Case No. 26-000067-MZ

THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,

Hon. Randy J. Wallace

Defendant.
_____ /

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF OPINION AND ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY DISPOSITION

On May 28, 2026, this Court issued an opinion and order that granted defendant's motion for summary disposition. On May 29, 2026, plaintiff moved for reconsideration of that opinion and order. Upon review of the motion, the Court determines that most of the arguments were raised and decided in the context of the motion for summary disposition or are not relevant to the statutory notice issue that the Court ruled was dispositive. The Court declines to consider these arguments. See Court of Claims LCR 2.119(F)(3).

As it relates to statutory notice, plaintiff raises a new argument that this Court committed a palpable error by its "failure to apply the disability tolling provision of [MCL] 600.5851(1) to [plaintiff's] period of involuntary confinement[.]" Although plaintiff briefly cited MCL 600.5851 in his April 9, 2026 amended complaint, he did not allege in the amended complaint that he is or was disabled for purposes of the statute. Nor did he raise this argument in his response to defendant's motion for summary disposition. See *Walters v Nadell*, 481 Mich 377, 388; 751

NW2d 431 (2008) ("Trial courts are not the research assistants of the litigants; the parties have a duty to fully present their legal arguments to the court for its resolution of their dispute.").

The Court declines to consider the merits of this new argument regarding disability tolling in the context of a motion for reconsideration. See *Yoost v Caspari*, 295 Mich App 209, 220; 813 NW2d 783 (2012). Accordingly, plaintiff's motion is DENIED for failure to demonstrate a palpable error by which the Court and the parties have been misled. LCR 2.119(F)(3).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: May 29, 2026

Hon. Randy J. Wallace
Judge, Court of Claims