STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF CLAIMS

GLOBAL LINK INTERNATIONAL,

Plaintiff,

v Case No. 26-000117-MZ

THE MICHIGAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, Hon. Michael J. Riordan

Defendant.
_____ /

OPINION AND ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S 9/10/26 MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

On August 21, 2026, the Court granted defendant's motion for summary disposition and dismissed plaintiff's action for failure to provide timely notice of its claim under MCL 600.6431(1). Plaintiff seeks reconsideration of that decision. A motion for reconsideration may only enter upon a demonstration of "a palpable error by which the court and the parties have been misled and show that a different disposition of the motion must result from correction of the error." MCR 2.119(F)(3).

Plaintiff contends that the Court already permitted plaintiff to remedy the verification deficiency in the complaint pursuant to its June 12, 2026 order to show cause, and plaintiff did so. Accordingly, plaintiff contends, this Court should not have dismissed the complaint upon defendant's motion. However, there are two requirements that must be met to invoke this Court's jurisdiction under MCL 600.6431(1): the complaint must be verified *and* notice of the claim must

be timely filed. Although a deficiency in verification can be remedied, a lack of timely notice cannot. Plaintiff's claims accrued on March 18, 2025, requiring notice to be filed by March 18, 2026. The first notice of plaintiff's claim came through its complaint, which was not filed until May 6, 2026. Dismissal was required by statute.

Plaintiff also contends that the parties' contract vested exclusive jurisdiction over this dispute with the Ingham Circuit Court. Plaintiff has not explained why it failed to challenge the transfer of this case from the Ingham Circuit Court to this Court. Moreover, the notice and verification requirements of the Court of Claims Act apply to an action against a state actor regardless of whether the action is filed in the Court of Claims or the circuit court. *Christie v Wayne State Univ*, 511 Mich 39, 45; 993 NW2d 203 (2023). Reinstating the action and transferring it back to the circuit court would be an exercise in futility as this Court's exclusive, statutory jurisdiction cannot be abrogated by a private agreement or contract between the parties. See MCL 600.6419; *Progress Mich v Attorney General*, 506 Mich 74, 87-88; 954 NW2d 475 (2020) (explaining that under the doctrine of sovereign immunity, "the state, as the creator of the courts, [is] not subject to them or their jurisdiction" except as the State consents to jurisdiction in statute).

The Court DENIES plaintiff's motion for reconsideration.

Date: 09/18/2026

Michael J. Riordan
Judge, Court of Claims