STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF CLAIMS

VINCE BURGESS,

Plaintiff,

v Case No. 26-000112-MM

MICHIGAN STATE POLICE, Hon. Michael F. Gadola

Defendant.
_____ /

ORDER REGARDING FUTURE FILINGS

Plaintiff filed the current action in this Court without proper verification as required by MCL 600.6431(2)(d) of the Court of Claims Act (COCA). This is the seventh action filed by plaintiff in this Court with the same deficiency since August 2024.

In *Burgess v Poortinga*, Docket No. 24-000208-MZ, plaintiff filed an unverified complaint, but responded to the Court's order to show cause by filing an amended, verified complaint. In *Burgess v Ctr for Forensic Psychiatry*, Docket No. 25-000027-MZ, plaintiff again filed an unverified complaint, but did not respond to the Court's order to show cause, resulting in the dismissal of his action. In *Burgess v Mich Dep't of Civil Rights*, Docket No. 25-000145-MM, plaintiff initiated his case with yet another unverified complaint. Like in Docket No. 24-208, plaintiff timely responded to the order to show cause with an amended verified complaint. In Docket No. 26-000056-MZ, *Burgess v Ctr for Forensic Psychiatry*, despite that his identical suit in Docket No. 25-27 was dismissed for failure to file a verified complaint, plaintiff filed yet another

unverified complaint, causing the Court to issue an order to show cause. For the third time, plaintiff timely responded with an amended verified complaint.

This is plaintiff's third attempt to file suit against the Michigan State Police. In the prior cases, Docket Nos. 26-000059-MM and 26-000085-MM, plaintiff did not file a verified complaint to initiate his action, did not respond to the order to show cause with an amended verified complaint, and his actions were dismissed. Judge Patel has entered the **seventh** order to show cause in cases filed by plaintiff in this Court. Plaintiff has demonstrated that he can comply by filing an amended verified complaint, because he has done so on three prior occasions. Moreover, by his seventh action filed in this Court, there is no plausible excuse for plaintiff to continue filing complaints without including the following statement at the conclusion of the complaint: "I declare under penalty of perjury that this Complaint has been examined by me and that its contents are true to the best of my information, knowledge, and belief," and signing that complaint before a licensed notary.

The number of deficient filings requires action by this Court. The judicial branch exists to afford our residents a forum to peacefully resolve their legitimate disputes. Tens of thousands of cases are filed each year in Michigan and our court system does its best to provide quick and efficient justice to those seeking resolution of a dispute. These efforts are unnecessarily delayed when this Court is repeatedly required to address cases improperly initiated by the same plaintiff.

At this point, plaintiff has demonstrated a continuing pattern in this Court of initiating actions that do not comply with the Court of Claims Act and correcting these deficiencies in a piecemeal fashion despite repeated notice from this Court as to what is required. The Court ORDERS that any future filings by plaintiff in this Court must include a request for leave to file

them. The Clerk of the Court of Claims will forward any future filings to the Chief Judge to review for compliance with the Court of Claims Act. If the filing does not comply with the Court of Claims Act, the filing will be administratively rejected.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: May 29, 2026

Michael F. Gadola
Chief Judge, Court of Claims