

Order

Michigan Supreme Court
Lansing, Michigan

November 26, 2025

Megan K. Cavanagh,
Chief Justice

ADM File No. 2025-08

Brian K. Zahra
Richard H. Bernstein
Elizabeth M. Welch
Kyra H. Bolden
Kimberly A. Thomas
Noah P. Hood,
Justices

Amendment of Administrative
Order No. 2022-1

On order of the Court, the following amendment of Administrative Order No. 2022-1 is adopted, effective immediately.

Administrative Order No. 2022-1 – Commission on Fairness and Public Trust~~Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion~~ in the Michigan Judiciary

Const 1963, art 6, § 1 vests judicial power exclusively in one court of justice. The ability of courts to fulfill their mission and perform their functions is based on the public’s trust and confidence in the judiciary. The judiciary earns that trust and confidence by faithfully performing its duties. In order to increase and maintain public trust and to provide an experience that is accessible, fair, and impartial for all court users, the judicial branch must ensure the one court of justice is fair to all. Therefore, on order of the Court and effective immediately, the Commission on Fairness and Public Trust in the Michigan Judiciary is established. In January 2021, the Michigan Supreme Court and the State Court Administrative Office created a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Committee with the initial goal of exploring issues related to the demographics of the workforce that support our judiciary and training within the judicial branches. The Committee’s work grew to include exploration of other topics that impact our communities. On October 1, 2021, the Committee presented a report to the Supreme Court that included a recommendation that the Court create an ongoing interdisciplinary Commission to continue and build on the work that has been done to date. Therefore, on order of the Court, the Commission on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in the Michigan Judiciary is created, effective immediately

I. Purpose

The purpose of the Commission on Fairness and Public Trust~~Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion~~ in the Michigan Judiciary is to assess and work towards elimination of demographic and other disparities in court experiences within the Michigan judiciary and justice system. The goals of the Commission include:

- Develop policies and standards to promote fairness and accountability within the judiciary~~diversity, equity, and inclusion~~;
- Ensure that all those served by the justice system are heard, valued, and respected.~~Assist the judicial branch with elimination of disparities within the justice system~~;

- Create pathways to build a judicial workforce possessing varied and transferrable skillsets to help foster trust in the court system.~~Increase participation of members from under represented communities in judicial branch leadership;~~
- Assist local courts with implementation of diversity, equity, and inclusion plans and processes that further fairness and public trust in the judiciary.;
- Collaborate with other judicial branch commissions, governmental entities, and ~~private~~ partners to propose and implement policies aimed at achieving a more fair and just judicial~~diverse, equitable, and inclusive~~ justice system.

II. Duties

The Commission will identify and assess ~~the demographic and other~~ disparities in court experiences within the judicial branch and the justice system and develop, coordinate, and implement initiatives to achieve the previously described goals.~~Toward this end, the Commission is directed to work with an expert facilitator to develop a strategic plan to guide the initial work of the Commission.~~

III. [Unchanged.]

IV. Commission Membership

- A. Membership shall consist~~be comprised~~ of 25 members from the following groups:

1.-4. [Unchanged.]

5. One member each, recommended by the following and appointed by the Supreme Court:

a. The Michigan Court of Appeals;

b. The Michigan Judges Association (circuit court judge);

c. The Michigan District Judges Association;

d. The Michigan Probate Judges Association;

e. The Michigan Court Administration Association;

a.-g. [Relettered f.-m. but otherwise unchanged.]

6. One member each, appointed by the Supreme Court, from the following additional bodies/stakeholder groups ~~as members~~:
 - ~~a. The Michigan Court of Appeals;~~
 - ~~b. The Michigan Judges Association (Circuit Court Judge);~~
 - ~~c. The Michigan District Judges Association;~~
 - ~~d. The Michigan Probate Judges Association;~~
 - ~~e. The Michigan Court Administrators Association;~~
 - af. [Relettered a. but otherwise unchanged.]
 - bg. Four members of various ~~affinity and/or special purpose~~ bar associations ~~(as defined by the Commission's Executive Team)~~;
 - ch. [Relettered c. but otherwise unchanged.]

B. Appointments. With the exception of the members who will serve by virtue of their status (See Section IV.A.2 to IV.A.4), the Supreme Court shall appoint all members of the Commission.

1. Members serving on the commission as of November 26, 2025 remain the appointed members of the Commission on Fairness and Public Trust in the Michigan judiciary. Their term expiration dates and terms served will remain the same as when they were originally appointed.
- ~~1. Within 60 days of entry of this order, the groups identified in Section IV.A.5 shall submit the names of their initial recommended designee to the Executive Team for consideration.—~~
- ~~2. The Executive Team will promptly establish a process to solicit and receive applications for membership for the initial appointment of groups identified in Section IV.A.6.~~
- ~~3. Within 120 days of entry of this order, the Executive Team will submit to the Court its recommendations for the initial Commission members described in subsection 1 and 2 above, and the Court will appoint the Commission members within 30 days thereafter.~~

~~24. After initial appointments are complete, t~~The Executive Team ~~must~~will develop and implement a process for ~~reviewing~~receiving future recommendations and applications and for making recommendations to the Michigan Supreme Court for appointments and reappointments that are based on commitment to the purpose and goals of the Commission and to ensure diversity of membership.

- C. Terms – With the exception of the ~~appointments of a sitting Michigan Supreme Court Justice, the State Bar of Michigan Executive Director, the Michigan State Bar Foundation Executive Director, and the State Court Administrator,~~ members of the Commission will be appointed for three-year terms and may not consecutively serve more than~~will be limited to serving~~ two full terms. A member who has consecutively served two full terms may subsequently be eligible to be re-appointed after not serving for a full term. Initial terms will commence on the date of appointment and may be less than three years to ensure that the terms are staggered~~with initial terms of one year, two years, and three years.~~ All members appointed or reappointed following these inaugural terms will serve three-year terms. After initial appointment, all terms commence January 1st of each calendar year.

~~Justice Elizabeth M. Welch and Judge Cynthia D. Stephens are appointed to the Commission and shall serve as the initial co-chairs.~~

- D. Vacancy – The Executive Team may declare a vacancy exists if a commissioner resigns from his or her position from the Commission or moves outside of Michigan or a commissioner does not attend two consecutive meetings without being excused by the chair or co-chairs. If the vacancy is from a group identified in Section IV.A.5, that group shall recommend for appointment another person to fill the vacancy. In the event of other vacancies on the Commission, the Executive Team will recommend to the Supreme Court appointment of a replacement member who will serve the remainder of the term of the former incumbent. After serving the remainder of the term, the new member may be reappointed as provided in Section IV.C~~for no more than two full consecutive terms.~~

V.-VIII. [Unchanged.]

WELCH, J. (*concurring*). The words that adorn this Court’s official seal—*Discite Justitiam Moniti*—translate roughly to “be advised, learn justice.” The Commission on Fairness and Public Trust (the FPT Commission) exists to help fulfill this ancient command by assisting this Court in learning ways to better deliver justice and serve the public. In

recent years, this Court has dramatically updated its approach towards considering and making changes to the delivery of court services. Rather than making decisions alone, we have engaged key stakeholders from a variety of personal and professional backgrounds who work with or adjacent to the legal profession—including attorneys and judges on our front lines, as well as members of the public—to offer their expertise and wisdom as we justices work to do what we were elected to do: serve our state and its communities.

Although the public knows that we decide cases appealed to our Court, it knows less about our administrative work—that is, the behind-the-scenes work that shapes how the judiciary operates each day in courthouses across the state. In 2021, under the leadership of Chief Justice MCCORMACK, this Court established the Michigan Judicial Council to institute a strategic plan for our state court system. Although effective organizations in the business and nongovernmental worlds know that strategic planning is an important facet of defining future goals, fostering an environment of innovation and productivity, and ensuring alignment among team members, our judiciary lacked such a plan to guide our 4 municipal courts, 57 circuit courts, 78 probate courts, and approximately 100 district courts across the state. Led by the Chief Justice, the Judicial Council is composed of 29 members—including judges, lawyers, county clerks, and members of the public—who meet regularly to work through the plan and make recommendations for improving court operations across our state.

Prior to the creation of the Judicial Council, this Court learned the value of broad stakeholder input from the Justice For All (JFA) Task Force, which led to the creation of the JFA Commission. Co-chaired by Justice ZAHRA since its inception, the JFA Commission has become vital to ensuring that people navigating our civil justice system have access to the resources they need. This work is critical, considering that the JFA Task Force found that “at least one side represented themselves in 75% of civil cases because they could not afford a lawyer.” Michigan JFA Task Force, *Strategic Plan and Inventory Report* (December 2020), p 4; available at <<https://www.courts.michigan.gov/4af54d/siteassets/committees,-boards-special-initiatves/justiceforall/final-jfa-report-121420.pdf>> (accessed August 18, 2025) [<https://perma.cc/UKJ4-EN7C>]. The JFA Commission’s work has been innovative and effective, and I am privileged to have served on several of its work groups. Like the Judicial Council and the FPT Commission, the JFA Commission has a broad coalition of stakeholders who understand the civil legal system and thus are best equipped to make recommendations to the Supreme Court on best practices for ensuring accessibility to the justice system. Relevantly, this Court learned a great deal from the successful process used to create the JFA Commission and therefore modeled the setup and planning for the FPT Commission using a similar format.¹

¹ Justice ZAHRA implies that the creation of the FPT Commission was somehow rushed and lacking in transparency, but the process was similar to that used to create the JFA

After seeking significant stakeholder input and meeting monthly for nearly a year, the FPT Commission’s members settled upon several objectives, including ensuring that the people served by the judiciary are valued and respected, that we cultivate talent pathways for our judiciary and courthouse staff, and that we work to retain our talented employees. Such objectives allow individuals to be judged on their merits, strengthen public confidence in the judiciary, and enable the judiciary to live up to the promise of equal justice for all.² Consistent with the seal of our Court, the Commission is part of our continued efforts to “be advised” and “learn justice.”

With those efforts in mind, I turn to the Court’s decision to change the Commission’s name to the Commission on Fairness and Public Trust. Dissenting, Justice ZAHRA takes issue with this decision.³ As a foundational matter, Justice ZAHRA and I agree on two points: first, we live in a politically polarized society; and second, the term “DEI” has become a political lightning rod. And I doubt that Justice ZAHRA and I disagree

Commission on which Justice ZAHRA has long served as co-chair. In May 2019, the Court created a Justice For All Task Force to “evaluate the civil justice system in Michigan” Administrative Order No. 2021-1, 507 Mich lxxxiv, lxxxiv (2021). The task force finalized its results in December 2020 and recommended that the Court create the JFA Commission. *Id.* This Court did so, and it stated that the goal of the JFA Commission “is to achieve 100% access to Michigan’s civil justice system” by “identifying and assessing gaps, barriers, and strategies to further improve access to Michigan’s civil justice system, especially for low- and moderate-income Michigan residents.” *Id.* at lxxxiv-lxxxv.

Similarly, in January 2021, the Michigan Supreme Court and the State Court Administrative Office created a committee tasked with an initial goal of exploring issues related to “the workforce that support[s] our judiciary and training within the judicial branches.” Administrative Order No. 2022-1, 508 Mich civ, civ (2022). That committee then presented a report to the Supreme Court that included a recommendation that “the Court create an ongoing interdisciplinary Commission to continue and build on the work that has been done to date.” *Id.* The Court implemented this recommendation and created the Commission in January 2022. *Id.*

² And importantly, both the JFA and FPT Commissions are focused on court users’ experiences. The JFA Commission seeks to remedy income disparities in accessing the civil justice system. The FPT Commission seeks to ensure public trust through accountability, broad stakeholder input, and a workforce that serves our communities. Both commissions are working toward improving our courts and how they serve our communities.

³ At the most fundamental level, I question how the Court’s decision could lack transparency, considering that the Court published this order announcing its decision.

on a third and arguably more important point: that the FPT Commission's goals are meritorious and worthwhile. Recall that the Commission's goals are to:

- Develop policies and standards to promote fairness and accountability within the judiciary.
- Ensure that all those served by the justice system are heard, valued, and respected.
- Create pathways to build a judicial workforce possessing varied and transferrable skillsets to help foster trust in the court system.
- Assist local courts with implementation of plans and processes that further fairness and public trust in the judiciary.
- Collaborate with other judicial branch commissions, governmental entities, and partners to propose and implement policies aimed at achieving a more fair and just judicial system.

Committed to those goals, and in the spirit of being advised and learning justice, the Commission became aware of two seemingly contradictory facts: that “DEI” is now a polarizing concept in American life, while, at the same time, a commitment to fairness, acceptance of others, and equity is not.⁴ For those reasons, the Commission adopted a name that accurately reflects the work it is doing and accords with universal values that are embraced in our state and federal Constitutions.

We are facing a world with rapid technological change, decreasing faith in our democratic institutions (including the judiciary), and polarizing rhetoric. Although the judiciary in Michigan has managed to maintain a better image than other branches of government, I believe this is precisely because of the efforts we are making to demonstrate

⁴ Public polling data suggest that although some Americans may view the acronym “DEI” unfavorably, Americans agree overwhelmingly “with having diverse workplaces, equitable sharing of power in community meetings, and including people of all backgrounds when discussing” issues of public concern. Brodbeck et al, American Association for Public Opinion Research, *Beyond DEI: Understanding Public Opinion on Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion*, available at <<https://aapor.org/newsletters/beyond-dei-understanding-public-opinion-on-diversity-equity-inclusion/>> (accessed October 16, 2025) [<https://perma.cc/563L-KK7W>]. And contrary to Justice ZAHRA's assertions, the work of ensuring high-functioning workplaces has been around for decades and is not a new construct from 2020. See Kratz, *The Little Known History of DEI and Why It's Critical to Its Survival*, <<https://www.forbes.com/sites/juliekratz/2024/12/29/history-of-dei-why-it-matters-for-the-future/>> (accessed October 6, 2025) [<https://perma.cc/4AAB-9QMG>].

to the public that we are deserving of their trust. Our courts must stay that course and remember whom we serve: the people of our state. The FPT Commission was created precisely to ensure that we center service to the people of the state and remain steadfast in our commitment to transparency, best practices for retaining and attracting talent, and processes that ensure dignity and fairness for every person who walks through our courthouse doors.⁵ To that end, the FPT Commission is one more vehicle for this Court to “be advised,” and to “learn justice.”

ZAHRA, J. (*dissenting*).

Michigan, like the rest of our nation, is a “politically polarized society.”¹ It has become common knowledge that we tend more and more to look across the aisle with bitterness and suspicion. Nowhere is this divide wider than on social issues, where tensions flare over concerns of identity and debates hold powerful emotional weight for all involved.

It was in the context of this division that in January 2021, the State Court Administrative Office created a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Committee,² which just 10 months later presented to this Court a report calling for the creation of a DEI commission to function within the Michigan judiciary. The DEI Committee report was never released to the public, and the question whether to create such a commission was never presented for public comment. Nonetheless, on January 5, 2022, this Court first

⁵ Justice ZAHRA and I both firmly believe in the Court’s core mission of ensuring equal justice under the law, but I find it difficult to understand his assertion that the FPT Commission has not been transparent. Like the JFA Commission, the FPT Commission was created by an administrative order of this court, which sets forth its purpose and responsibilities. Our public orders also of course provide the opportunity for justices to make statements, which is exactly what has occurred here. Like the JFA Commission, the FPT Commission has broad representation from across the state and holds a public meeting each year. Its work groups include noncommission members, regularly engage with subject-matter experts in our local courts, and have engaged with community stakeholders. And like the JFA Commission, the FPT Commission publishes its reports on the Court’s website. I struggle to understand how the Commission could be more transparent in its work.

¹ Administrative Order No. 2022-1, 508 Mich civ, cxvi (2022) (VIVIANO, J., dissenting).

² The origins of the DEI Committee itself are a mystery, “as a proposal to create it was never discussed by the Court and its existence went almost entirely unmentioned.” *Id.* at cxv.

ordered the creation of the Commission on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in the Michigan Judiciary. Justice VIVIANO authored a dissent against this initial order, which I joined.³

I have serious concerns regarding DEI. I strongly believe that the programs, policies, and rhetoric of DEI are divisive and threaten the fundamental promises of America: equality under the law and justice for all. Others believe just as strongly that DEI is necessary to fulfill these very same promises; that without it, grave disparities will persist between demographics and prevent equal access to these fundamental commitments of our society. Wherever one lands on this argument, something profoundly important is at stake. This leads to anger and distrust on both sides even as each strives for its vision of justice. It also leads to actions that needlessly undermine our trust in each other and in our institutions. Which brings us to this Court's current action changing the name of the DEI Commission to the Commission on Fairness and Public Trust, an action that quite ironically provides all the more reason to question whether this rebranding promotes public trust.

The main problem with the order now before us has nothing to do with partisanship or ideology. Nor does it implicate DEI, or the manner in which the Court addresses unfairness and disparities. The issue here is one of transparency and the integrity of our republican system of government.

Our system is founded on the idea that the citizenry honors a small number of its own by granting them the authority to govern on the citizens' behalf with the understanding that this small number is beholden to the whole, reports to it, and serves at its pleasure. The authority does not belong to those with whom it is entrusted but to the people, and the people are therefore entitled to know how that authority is used. We must demand transparency from those who wield power on behalf of the people. What they do, they must do in the open if citizens are to meaningfully participate in government.

Few would question the self-evident value of transparency in government. Indeed, in her concurrence supporting this order, Justice WELCH claims that "the [Fairness and Public Trust] Commission was created precisely to ensure that we . . . remain steadfast in our commitment to transparency . . ." But what does it say about our commitment to transparency that this Court is willing to scrape the name off its DEI Commission at a time when DEI just so happens to be losing its popularity among the people?⁴ Is it transparent

³ See *id.* at cxiv, cxxi.

⁴ A recent Rasmussen Reports national telephone and online survey found that 53% of likely United States voters approve of ending government DEI programs, including 39% who strongly approve. By contrast, 42% of likely voters disapprove of ending such government programs, including 29% who strongly disapprove of ending DEI policies in the federal government. Rasmussen Reports, *53% Approve Trump Ending DEI Policies* (February 20, 2025), available at <https://www.rasmussenreports.com/public_content/politics/trump_administration_secon

to alter the name of this Commission but leave its members and its powers unchanged? The majority may point out that the new amendment alters the language outlining the aims of this Commission, but these changes only serve to obscure the Commission's origins in DEI without any meaningful transformation. For example, the duties of the Commission were initially described as follows: "The Commission will assess the demographic and other disparities within the judicial branch"⁵ Now, the Commission will "identify and assess disparities in court experiences within the judicial branch" What is the difference between "assess[ing] *the demographic and other* disparities within the judicial branch" and "assess[ing] disparities . . . within the judicial branch"? Certainly, the Commission remains empowered to assess demographic disparities. This was the original intent of the Commission; why can we assume that this intent changed? It is far more reasonable to assume that the Commission will pursue its original DEI goals, but will now do so shielded from the public's increasingly negative views on DEI.

However one views DEI or any other issue of the day, there are timeless values that must transcend political disagreements. Transparency is one such value. Without transparency, there can be no public trust, no properly functioning republic at all.⁶ If the majority of this Court wished to continue with DEI even in the face of its waning popularity, they ought to do so without obfuscation. Instead, the public is today only offered more rhetoric, as we are told by Justice WELCH that "the Commission adopted [FPT as] a name that accurately reflects the work it is doing and accords with universal values that are embraced in our state and federal Constitutions." This is a DEI Commission, no matter what name the Court now intends to give it or how vaguely the Court intends to phrase its goals. The majority ought to have stood by their conviction that DEI was necessary and allowed Michiganders to judge, on the basis of clear facts, whether they approved of this Court's exercise of its authority.

The Commission ought to be debated on its true merits. This is what we do in a republic; we seek truth and justice openly and subject the actions of our government to the scrutiny of its citizens. We do not attempt to pull the wool over the eyes of the very people who elected us and from whom we derive our authority.

Finally, I am compelled to comment on the concurrence authored by Justice WELCH, which attempts to explain the sudden and immediate need to change the name of the Commission on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion to the Commission on Fairness and Public

d_term/53_approve_trump_ending_dei_policies> (accessed March 20, 2025) [https://perma.cc/RCK9-K8GU].

⁵ AO 2022-1, 508 Mich at cv.

⁶ It should be lost on no one that the Court places its public trust at risk by changing the name of the DEI Commission to the Commission on Fairness and Public Trust.

Trust. She writes that “the Commission became aware of two seemingly contradictory facts: that ‘DEI’ is now a polarizing concept in American life, while, at the same time, a commitment to fairness, acceptance of others, and equity is not.” This supposed contradiction lacks merit. DEI became a polarizing concept not because its goals are laudable; rather, it’s polarizing because it is an unelected body tasked with making value judgments on sensitive matters on which people may strongly disagree; regardless of whether those judgments are justified in terms of diversity, equity, and inclusion, or in terms of fairness and public trust. While many Americans may support a commitment to fairness, acceptance of others, and equity, it is only because they do so on their own terms, not on the terms imposed by an unelected commission. As an example, it’s entirely acceptable for someone to generally support the notion of everyone paying their “fair share” of taxes. Yet, the same person may still complain they are paying beyond what they consider their “fair share.”

Justice WELCH also appears to opine that it is inconsistent for me to support the Justice For All Commission and oppose the commission that is the subject of this Court’s rebranding order. I fail to find the logic in Justice WELCH’s concurring statement. The goal of the Justice For All Commission is clearly and simply stated: “to expand access to and enhance the quality of Michigan’s civil legal justice system” for those unable to retain an attorney in civil proceedings, with a stated aim of achieving 100% access for all Michigan residents.⁷ Providing access to the civil justice system has been a clearly stated responsibility of the legal profession for more than 50 years.⁸ Indeed, the duty of the bar to provide pro bono services to those unable to afford legal counsel is inculcated into law students commencing at the beginning of their legal education and renewed annually by bar associations across our nation.

Providing access to the civil justice system has never been a political or social issue; it has always been accepted as a duty imposed on lawyers for the privilege of practicing law. The Justice For All Commission addresses this well-documented obligation of the Michigan bar. By contrast, DEI gained popularity in corporate America around 2020, in large part as a response to the Black Lives Matter movement, when many Fortune 500

⁷ Administrative Order No. 2021-1, 507 Mich lxxxiv, lxxxiv (2021).

⁸ See Legal Services Corporation, *Celebrating the 50th Anniversary* <<https://www.lsc.gov/celebrate50>> (accessed August 27, 2025) [<https://perma.cc/R3Z-MWKY>].

companies issued DEI statements and created DEI positions within the corporate structure.⁹ This movement was immediately met with pushback, and a number of companies and public institutions have retreated from their initial DEI platforms.¹⁰ Thus, for better or worse, DEI is a hot political and social issue that deeply divides our state. The difference between DEI and Justice For All is clear: one is a political issue on which the people of Michigan are sharply divided; the other represents an attempted solution to an ethical obligation of the Michigan bar. Given that courts are expected to be neutral arbiters of disputes, I would stay out of the political divide that is DEI and focus my energy on addressing Michigan’s civil justice gap. I do not believe it is inconsistent for me to make this choice. On the contrary, I conclude it is prudent for the judiciary to stay out of political debates. To the extent the Court insists on entering this political debate, however, it should demonstrate the courage and transparency of leaving the name of the DEI Commission unchanged.

I dissent from the entry of this order because the Court lacks transparency in effectuating a name change to the DEI Commission. I would not enter the order changing the name of this Commission and would instead dissolve the Commission.

⁹ Kratz, *The Little Known History of DEI and Why it’s Critical to its Survival*, Forbes (December 29, 2024) <<https://www.forbes.com/sites/juliekratz/2024/12/29/history-of-dei-why-it-matters-for-the-future/>> (accessed August 27, 2025).

¹⁰ See Murray and Bohannon, *IBM Reportedly Walks Back Diversity Policies, Citing “Inherent Tensions”*: Here Are All the Companies Rolling Back DEI Programs, FORBES (April 11, 2025), <<https://www.forbes.com/sites/conormurray/2025/04/11/ibm-reportedly-walks-back-diversity-policies-citing-inherent-tensions-here-are-all-the-companies-rolling-back-dei-programs/>> (accessed September 3, 2025) (listing Target, Smithsonian Institute, Google, Amazon, Accenture, PBS, Deloitte, Disney, Goldman Sachs, Coca-Cola, PepsiCo, JPMorgan Chase, Morgan Stanley, Citigroup, BlackRock, Bank of America, Paramount, Warner Bros. Discovery, State Street, and Victoria’s Secret).



I, Elizabeth Kingston-Miller, Clerk of the Michigan Supreme Court, certify that the foregoing is a true and complete copy of the order entered at the direction of the Court.

November 26, 2025

Elizabeth Kingston-Miller
Clerk