



500 West Big Beaver
Troy, MI 48084
troymi.gov

CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

Date: April 7, 2025

To: Honorable Mayor and City Council Members

From: Lori Grigg Bluhm, City Attorney
Allan T. Motzny, Assistant City Attorney
Julie Quinlan Dufrane, Assistant City Attorney
Nicole F. MacMillan, Assistant City Attorney
Geomy George, Extern, City Attorney's Office

Subject: First Quarter 2025 Litigation Report

The following is the quarterly report of pending litigation and other matters of interest.
Developments during the FIRST quarter of 2025 are in bold.

A. ANATOMY OF THE CASE

Once a lawsuit has been filed against the City or City employees, the City Attorney's office prepares a memo regarding the allegations in the complaint. At that time, our office requests authority from Council to represent the City and/or the employees. Our office then engages in the discovery process, which generally lasts for several months, and involves interrogatories, requests for documents, and depositions. After discovery, almost all cases are required to go through case evaluation (also called mediation). In this process, three attorneys evaluate the potential damages, and render an award. This award can be accepted by both parties, and will conclude the case. However, if either party rejects a case evaluation award, there are potential sanctions if the trial result is not as favorable as the mediation award. In many cases, a motion for summary disposition will be filed at the conclusion of discovery. In all motions for summary disposition, the Plaintiff's version of the facts are accepted as true, and if the Plaintiff still has failed to set forth a viable claim against the City, then dismissal will be granted. It generally takes at least a year before a case will be presented to a jury. It also takes approximately two years before a case will be finalized in the Michigan Court of Appeals and/or the Michigan Supreme Court.

B. ZONING CASES

These are cases where the property owner has sued for a use other than that for which the land is currently zoned and/or the City is suing a property owner to require compliance with the existing zoning provisions.

1. **Tollbrook, LLC v City of Troy** - Tollbrook submitted an application for a rezoning of three parcels on McClure, from one family residential zoning to Big Beaver Form Based District zoning. This application was proposed as a straight rezoning request, and was denied by Troy City Council, consistent with the recommendation from the Planning Commission. Plaintiff filed this Complaint, alleging substantive due process violations. Plaintiff filed it in Oakland County Circuit Court, and the City removed it to federal court,

since the parties previously litigated a very similar case before Judge Goldsmith. Plaintiff then filed a motion to request a transfer of the case back to the Oakland County Circuit Court. This motion was briefed by the parties, and is pending. The motion is still under advisement. On March 5, 2021, Judge Goldsmith entered an Order, remanding the case to the Oakland County Circuit Court. Plaintiff submitted a proposed confidential settlement offer that was considered and rejected by City Council. The City subsequently filed a Motion for Consolidation and Request for Transfer which was denied by the Circuit Court. This case is now in the discovery phase. The City of Troy filed a motion to dismiss with oral argument scheduled for March 9, 2022. The Court adjourned oral argument on its own motion. The parties are waiting for the Court to either reschedule argument or issue an opinion and order. The Court entered an Order reassigning this case to Judge Matis of the Oakland County Circuit Court. Plaintiff subsequently filed a motion objecting to the reassignment which will be argued on July 6, 2022. The Court also scheduled a pre-trial conference for the same date to discuss scheduling the City's outstanding Motion to Dismiss. At the pre-trial, Plaintiff's counsel asked the Court for permission to file a supplemental brief. The Court granted that request. Plaintiff then filed a brief which included some additional affidavits, and the City timely responded. The Court scheduled oral argument for October 12, 2022. The Court issued an opinion on December 13, 2022 granting in part and denying in part the City's Motion to Dismiss. The Court dismissed Plaintiff's Substantive Due Process claim, but ruled that Plaintiff's Takings Claim could proceed. The parties will engage in the discovery process pursuant to a scheduling order to be entered by the Court. Discovery continues in this case. Discovery continues in this case and will close on July 17, 2023. Thereafter, the City plans to file a motion to dismiss. The City timely filed its motion for summary disposition, which is scheduled for argument on October 18, 2023. In the interim, the Court ordered the parties to participate in a mandatory settlement conference, which was unsuccessful. The Court then granted the City's motion for summary disposition as to all of Plaintiff's remaining claims on October 25, 2023. Plaintiff subsequently filed a timely appeal to the Michigan Court of Appeals. Plaintiff/Appellant filed the transcript of proceedings on March 12, 2024, which triggers the deadline for Appellant's brief. Plaintiff/Appellant filed its Brief on Appeal on June 4, 2024. The City will file a timely Brief on Appeal. After submitting timely appellate briefs, the parties are waiting for the Court of Appeals to schedule a date and time for oral argument. **The Court scheduled the oral argument for May 6, 2025.**

2. **Tollbrook West LLC. v City of Troy** - Tollbrook West submitted an application to rezone two parcels located at 3109 Alpine and an adjacent vacant parcel from R-1B to Big Beaver District zoning. This straight rezoning application was denied by the Troy City Council on July 22, 2019, consistent with the Planning Commission recommendation. Plaintiff filed this Complaint, alleging substantive due process violations. Plaintiff filed it in Oakland County Circuit Court, and the City removed it to federal court, since the parties previously litigated a very similar case before Judge Goldsmith. Plaintiff then filed a motion to request a transfer of the case back to the Oakland County Circuit Court. This motion was briefed by the parties, and is pending. The motion is still under advisement. On March 5, 2021, Judge Goldsmith entered an Order, remanding the case to the Oakland County Circuit Court. Plaintiff submitted a proposed confidential settlement offer that was considered and rejected by City Council. The City subsequently filed a Motion for Consolidation and Request for Transfer which was denied by the Circuit Court. This case is now in the discovery phase. The City of Troy filed a motion to dismiss with oral argument scheduled for March 9, 2022. The Court adjourned oral argument on its own motion. The parties are waiting for the Court

to either reschedule argument or issue an opinion and order. The Court entered an Order reassigning this case to Judge Matis of the Oakland County Circuit Court. Plaintiff subsequently filed a motion objecting to the reassignment which will be argued on July 6, 2022. The Court also scheduled a pre-trial conference for the same date to discuss scheduling the City's outstanding Motion to Dismiss. At the pre-trial, Plaintiff's counsel asked the Court for permission to file a supplemental brief. The Court granted that request. Plaintiff then filed a brief which included some additional affidavits, and the City timely responded. The Court scheduled oral argument for October 12, 2022. The Court issued an opinion on December 13, 2022 granting in part and denying in part the City's Motion to Dismiss. The Court dismissed Plaintiff's Substantive Due Process claim, but ruled that Plaintiff's Takings Claim could proceed. The parties will engage in the discovery process pursuant to a scheduling order to be entered by the Court. Discovery continues in this case. Discovery continues in this case and will close on July 17, 2023. Thereafter, the City plans to file a motion to dismiss. The City timely filed its motion to dismiss, which is scheduled for oral argument on October 18, 2023. In the interim, the Court ordered the parties to participate in a mandatory settlement conference, which was unsuccessful. The Court then granted the City's motion for summary disposition as to all of Plaintiff's remaining claims on October 25, 2023. Plaintiff subsequently filed a timely appeal to the Michigan Court of Appeals. Plaintiff/Appellant filed the transcript of proceedings on March 12, 2024, which triggers the deadline for Appellant's brief. Plaintiff/Appellant filed its Brief on Appeal on June 4, 2024. The City will file a timely Brief on Appeal. After submitting timely appellate briefs, the parties are waiting for the Court of Appeals to schedule a date and time for oral argument. **The Court has scheduled oral argument for May 6, 2025.**

3. **Stafa et. al v. Troy-** This federal case was served on the City on March 20, 2024. It was filed by Safet Stafa, Tollbrook LLC, Tollbrook West LLC, Tollbrook North LLC and Arban Stafa against the City. It is currently assigned to Judge Nancy Edmunds. In the complaint, Plaintiffs argue that the City's actions in denying various rezoning requests was in retaliation for the numerous lawsuits Plaintiffs filed against the City, allegedly in violation of the First Amendment. The complaint also asserts an allegation that the City treated Plaintiffs differently than other developers and land owners, depriving Plaintiffs of rights to equal protection of the law. The case seeks damages, injunctive relief, and attorney fees under 42 U.S.C. Section 1983. The City's first responsive pleading is due on or before April 10, 2024. The City timely filed a Motion to Dismiss. Plaintiff subsequently filed a Motion for Temporary Restraining Order/Preliminary Injunction concerning one of its projects. The City filed a response and the parties are now awaiting a decision from the Court. After receipt of the City's Motion to Dismiss, Judge Goldsmith gave the Plaintiff the option to submit an amended complaint, and Plaintiff availed itself of that opportunity. On June 28, 2024, the City filed a Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint for failure to state a claim. Defendant filed a response to the City's motion to dismiss, and the Court has not yet ruled on this motion. The parties are also waiting for the Court's decision regarding Plaintiffs' request for a temporary restraining order and/or preliminary injunction. **On February 25, 2025, Judge Goldsmith granted the City's motion in part, dismissing the equal protection claim, but denied the City's motion to dismiss the First Amendment Retaliation claim, allowing this case to proceed through discovery. On March 25, 2025, Judge Goldsmith denied Plaintiff's Motion for a Temporary Restraining Order and a Preliminary Injunction.**

4. **Sterling Construction v. City of Troy** – Plaintiff/Appellant, Sterling Construction, Inc. submitted a site plan, seeking to develop 152 multi-family residential units on 5.72 acres of land located on the northwest corner of Crooks and Wattles which is zoned Neighborhood Node (“NN”). The site plan identified one of the proposed building types called for a maximum building height of 33.5 feet. The City’s Zoning Ordinance provides: “Any building, or portion of a building, on a parcel abutting a one-family residentially zoned parcel shall not exceed 2.5 stories, 30 feet in height.” (Troy Zoning Ordinance, Chapter 39, Section 5.06(E)(3)(c)(i)). Plaintiff argues that the City’s Zoning Administrator incorrectly applied the definition of “building height” as that term is defined in the City’s Zoning Ordinance. Plaintiff filed an appeal of the Zoning Administrator’s decision with the Troy Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA), which affirmed the Zoning Administrator. Plaintiff/Appellant then filed a Claim of Appeal from the ZBA decision, arguing that it was arbitrary and capricious and not supported by competent, material, and substantial evidence. The City of Troy timely filed the record on appeal with the Oakland County Circuit Court. Plaintiff/Appellant’s Brief on Appeal is due on October 1, 2024. The City will file its Response Brief in accordance with the Michigan Court Rules. The City timely filed its Response Brief. The case was reassigned to Judge Kwame Rowe, who scheduled oral argument for February 6, 2025. **On March 6, 2025, Judge Rowe issued his order, affirming the Troy Zoning Board of Appeals, and dismissed this appeal.**

5. **2955 E. Long Lake LLC et al v. City of Troy**- Plaintiffs/Appellants 2955 E. Long Lake LLC, Collard LLC, and National Express Wash LLC filed a joint application, seeking Preliminary Site Plan approval and Special Use approval for a proposed car wash with second story office space on their property located at the corner of E. Long Lake and Dequindre Roads. On November 12th, 2024, the Planning Commission denied the Special Use approval application. Plaintiffs then tried to file an appeal with the Troy Board of Zoning Appeals (ZBA), which was administratively denied, since the ZBA does not have the authority to review the Planning Commission decision in this case. Appellants then filed this appeal in the Oakland County Circuit Court, requesting a reversal of the Planning Commission’s decision. In the alternative, Appellants seek an order directing the ZBA to review the Planning Commission decision. The City timely filed the appellate record with the Oakland County Circuit Court, Judge Kwame Rowe. On March 28, 2025, Appellants filed their brief with the Court.

C. EMINENT DOMAIN CASES

These are cases in which the City wishes to acquire property for a public improvement and the property owner wishes to contest either the necessity or the compensation offered. In cases where only the compensation is challenged, the City obtains possession of the property almost immediately, which allows for major projects to be completed.

1. **Troy v KJ Property, et al.** – This condemnation case was initiated by the City on August 22, 2024 to acquire needed right of way for a planned road improvement project located on Rochester Road, from Barclay Drive to Trinway Drive. The case was assigned to Oakland County Circuit Court Judge David M. Cohen. A hearing on the complaint and the City’s request for immediate possession was initially set for September 25, 2024, but was subsequently adjourned. The Court issued a scheduling order establishing discovery deadlines and for the exchange of witness and exhibit lists. If the case is not resolved through facilitation or otherwise, a jury trial is scheduled for January 6, 2026. **The Court entered an order surrendering**

possession and vesting title in the subject property to the City. The parties then continued to negotiate a possible settlement, which was approved by the Troy City Council on March 10, 2025. The parties stipulated consent judgment was signed by Judge Cohen on March 12, 2025, concluding the case.

2. **Troy v Denha, et al.** – This condemnation case was initiated by the City on August 22, 2024 to acquire needed right of way for a planned road improvement project located on Rochester Road, from Barclay Drive to Trinway Drive. The case was assigned to Oakland County Circuit Court Judge Jeffery S. Matis. A hearing on the complaint and the City’s request for immediate possession was initially set for September 25, 2024, but was subsequently adjourned. The hearing on the complaint was initially adjourned to October 23, 2024 and then again to October 30, 2024. On October 30, 2024 the Court entered an order surrendering possession and vesting title to the property to the City. The order also required the City to pay the estimated just compensation to the property owner. The case will now proceed on the issue of just compensation only. The Court issued a scheduling order establishing discovery deadlines and for the exchange of witness and exhibit lists and appraisal reports and for facilitation. If the case is not resolved through facilitation or otherwise, a jury trial is scheduled for March 2, 2026. **The parties timely submitted Witness and Exhibit Lists for the jury trial.**
3. **Troy v Kreger, et al.** – This condemnation case was initiated by the City on August 22, 2024 to acquire needed right of way for a planned road improvement project located on Rochester Road, from Barclay Drive to Trinway Drive. The case was assigned to Oakland County Circuit Court Judge Martha Anderson. A hearing on the complaint has not yet been scheduled. The Court issued a scheduling order establishing discovery deadlines and for the exchange of witness and exhibit lists. If the case is not resolved through facilitation or otherwise, a jury trial is scheduled for January 5, 2026. **On January 17, 2025, the Court entered an order surrendering possession and vesting title in the subject property to the City, which required the City to pay the property owner the estimated just compensation, as determined by an independent appraisal. The case now continues to allow a jury to determine the total value of the property. The Court also required the parties to mediate this case, which is scheduled for October 23, 2025.**
4. **Troy v Potts, et al.** – This condemnation case was initiated by the City on August 22, 2024 to acquire needed right of way for a planned road improvement project located on Rochester Road, from Barclay Drive to Trinway Drive. The case was assigned to Oakland County Circuit Court Judge Nanci Grant. A hearing on the complaint has not yet been scheduled. The hearing on the complaint was set for October 23, 2024. Defendants Mr. and Mrs. Potts filed a motion to review necessity and to dismiss the case. The hearing on that motion was also scheduled for October 23, 2024. The City filed a timely response to the motion. Prior to the hearing date, the Potts withdrew their motion to challenge necessity and dismiss the case. On October 21, 2024 the Court entered an order surrendering possession and vesting title to the property to the City. The order also required the City to pay the estimated just compensation to Flagstar Bank, which is named as a defendant since it has a mortgage interest in the subject property. The case will now proceed on the issue of just compensation only. The Court issued a scheduling order establishing discovery deadlines and for the exchange of witness and exhibit lists. If the case is not resolved through facilitation or otherwise, a jury trial is scheduled for December 8, 2025. **The parties are currently in the discovery phase.**
5. **Troy v McDonald’s Corporation.** – **The City filed this condemnation case on February 11, 2025, seeking a permanent easement for public utilities and public service facilities for the Rochester Road improvement project, from Barclay Drive to Trinway Drive. The case was**

assigned to Oakland County Circuit Court Judge Daniel P. O'Brien. Judge O'Brien granted the City's motion to schedule a hearing on the complaint, which is now set for April 16, 2025. At that time, the City hopes to secure title for the easement, and will pay the estimated just compensation that was set by the City's appraiser.

6. **Troy v Micallef, et al.** –The City filed this condemnation case on February 11, 2025, seeking right of way and a permanent easement for public utilities and public service facilities for the Rochester Road improvement project, Barclay Drive to Trinway Drive. The case was assigned to Oakland County Circuit Court Judge Nancy J. Grant. The parties stipulated to an order setting the initial hearing on the complaint for April 23, 2025.
7. **Troy v Cinader, et al.** –On February 26, 2025, the City filed this condemnation case to acquire a permanent easement for public utilities and public service facilities for the Rochester Road improvement project, from Barclay Drive to Trinway Drive. Oakland County Circuit Court Judge Cheryl A. Matthews was assigned this case. The parties continue to negotiate a possible settlement in this case, so that the City can obtain possession of the needed property as soon as possible.
8. **Troy v The Kroger Company of Michigan, et al.** – The City filed this Rochester Road condemnation case on March 7, 2025. The City needs right of way and a permanent easement for public utilities and public service facilities. The case was assigned to Oakland County Circuit Court Judge Nanci J. Grant. The City's motion for possession is currently scheduled for April 23, 2025.
9. **Troy v Cassani, et al.** – This Rochester Road Improvement Project condemnation case was filed on March 7, 2025. The City is seeking a permanent easement for public utilities and public service facilities and a regrading and temporary construction easement. Oakland County Circuit Court Judge Daniel P O'Brien is the assigned judge for this case. The City has requested a hearing so that it can obtain title to the property, in exchange for the amount determined by the City's appraiser. The property owners will eventually have the opportunity to challenge this property value at a jury trial.
10. **Troy v 5024 Rochester, LLC, et al.** – This is another Rochester Road Improvement Project condemnation case filing, submitted on March 20, 2025. The City has requested an initial hearing before the assigned Oakland County Circuit Court Judge Mary Ellen Brennan, seeking title to the property needed for the Project.
11. **Troy v Troy Landmark Properties, et al.** – This condemnation case was initiated by the City on March 20, 2025. The City is seeking a strip of real estate and a permanent easement for public utilities and public service facilities for the Rochester Road Improvement Project. The case was assigned to Oakland County Circuit Court Judge Daniel P O'Brien. The City has requested an initial hearing, seeking an order granting title and requiring payment of the estimated just compensation.
12. **Troy v Nima Group, LLC, et al.** – The City filed this Rochester Road Improvement Project condemnation case on March 20, 2025. Through this case, the City hopes to acquire a permanent easement for public utilities and public service facilities and a regrading and temporary construction easement. The case was assigned to Oakland County Circuit Court Judge Kwame L. Rowe. The next step is the scheduling of the initial hearing.

13. **Troy v DB Troy, LLC et al.** – For the Rochester Road Improvement Project, Barclay Drive to Trinway Drive, the City filed this condemnation case on March 20, 2025. The City needs to acquire a permanent easement for public utilities and public service facilities at the Firebird Tavern location. Oakland County Circuit Court Judge Mary Ellen Brennan is the assigned judge, who will hopefully quickly schedule the initial hearing on the complaint.

D. CIVIL RIGHTS CASES

These are cases that are generally filed in the federal courts, under 42 U.S.C. Section 1983. In these cases, the Plaintiffs argue that the City and/or police officers of the City of Troy somehow violated their civil rights.

1. **Gillman v. Troy et. al** - Steven Gillman filed this lawsuit on November 29, 2021, as the Personal Representative of the Estate of Megan Miller. Ms. Miller died after being detained in the City's lock up facility on an alleged parole violation and also because Troy police officers wanted to speak with her about the death of her infant child. The Complaint alleges that while Miller was in custody, the City and its employee knew or should have known that she was suffering from a serious medical need associated with recent drug use. The Complaint alleges that the City and its employee were deliberately indifferent to Miller's serious medical needs, and that the City maintained an unconstitutional custom, policy, practice or custom and/or inadequately trained its personnel which resulted in the wrongful death of Miller while she was in the City's custody. Plaintiff's 42 U.S.C. Section 1983 claims are asserted under the Eighth and Fourteenth Amendments of the United States Constitution. Plaintiff also asserts a state law claim against the individual employee for alleged gross negligence. The City timely filed its answer to the Complaint. The Court held a scheduling conference and the parties are engaging in the discovery process. The discovery process continues. Discovery continues. Plaintiff filed a Motion to Extend Discovery which was granted by the Court, so discovery continues and depositions have been scheduled. Discovery closed in this matter on February 10, 2023. The City timely filed its Motion for Summary Judgment on February 17, 2023. The parties are waiting for the Court to issue an opinion in this matter. The Court also issued a new scheduling order in this case moving trial to March of 2024. On July 25, 2023, Judge Goldsmith granted the City's Motion for Summary Judgment, but denied the individual Police Service Aid's motion. The Police Service Aide then timely filed an appeal of this decision with the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals on August 21, 2023. The Court issued a briefing schedule. Appellant's brief is due on November 1, 2023; Appellee's brief is due December 3, 2023. The Court granted extensions of time to file the appellate briefs. Appellant's brief was timely filed on February 26, 2024. Appellee's brief is due on March 27, 2024. The Appellee filed a corrected Brief on Appeal on May 30, 2024. The briefing is concluded in this case, and the parties are awaiting a date for oral argument. The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals entertained oral argument on October 31, 2024. The parties are waiting for a decision. **On January 22, 2025, the Sixth Circuit issued its opinion, finding that the lower Court erred when it denied the PSA's motion to dismiss the Plaintiff's state law claims based on governmental immunity. The Court declined to exercise jurisdiction over the issues raised concerning the qualified immunity claims. The case was then remanded to District Court Judge Goldsmith, who allowed the filing of a request to file a second motion for summary judgment, based on subsequent changes in case law. This request was filed with the Court on March 27, 2025, and Plaintiff filed his response on April 1, 2025.**

2. **Melvin Matsey v. Troy, et al.** - Melvin Matsey was a suspect in some burglaries in the area and had been under surveillance by the Troy Police Department Special Investigations Unit (SIU). On March 9, 2022, at approximately 8:30pm, Matsey was observed running away from a closed business carrying something under his arm. He quickly got into his parked car and drove away. SIU officers followed him, and used a boxing maneuver to stop him. Officers then got Matsey out of his car, and took him in for questioning. Plaintiff's complaint alleges there was no legal basis for the boxing maneuver, and that he was falsely arrested. He alleges injuries, pain and psychological trauma resulted. Plaintiff's complaint is brought under 42 USC, Section 1983 and it asserts claims under the 5th, 8th, and 14th Amendments of the United States Constitution. Plaintiff also asserts state law claims against the individual officers for assault and battery, intentional infliction of emotional distress and alleged gross negligence. He is seeking damages in an amount exceeding \$75,000, plus interest, costs and attorney fees. On June 26, 2024, Judge Kumar, the U.S. District Court Judge assigned to this case, entered a scheduling order. On August 20, 2024, Plaintiff filed an amended complaint specifically identifying all of the individual officers involved in the March 9, 2022 encounter. The City will file a timely response. The City has also initiated discovery. The City filed a response to the amended complaint, and the parties are engaging in discovery. **The attorney for one of the co-defendants requested an adjournment of the case, due to an expected medical leave. This was stipulated to by the parties, and granted by the Court.**
3. **Edward Ross v. Troy, et. al.**- Plaintiff filed this lawsuit under 42 U.S.C. Section 1983, claiming a deprivation of his constitutional rights resulting from his termination as a volunteer firefighter. The complaint was served on the City and the individual defendants on August 1, 2024. A timely response will be filed with the Court. The City timely filed its answer. The parties are scheduled for mediation on March 5, 2025. **The parties were not able to successfully mediate this case and the administrative law proceeding. The parties are now in the discovery phase.**

E. PERSONAL INJURY AND DAMAGE CASES

These are cases in which the Plaintiff claims that the City or City employees were negligent in some manner that caused injuries and/or property damage. The City enjoys governmental immunity from ordinary negligence, unless the case falls within one of four exceptions to governmental immunity: a) defective highway exception, which includes sidewalks and road way claims; b) public building exception, which imposes liability only when injuries are caused by a defect in a public building; c) motor vehicle exception, which imposes liability when an employee is negligent when operating their vehicle; d) proprietary exception, where liability is imposed when an activity is conducted primarily to create a profit, and the activity somehow causes injury or damage to another; e) trespass nuisance exception, which imposes liability for the flooding cases.

1. **Tschirhart v. Troy** - Plaintiff filed this wrongful death lawsuit against the City, claiming that the City and individual City employees and contractors were responsible for the drowning death of Plaintiff's son, Shaun Tschirhart, at the Community Center pool on April 15, 2015. Shaun was a swimming in the pool that day as part of a Friendship Club activity, and unfortunately suffered a seizure while swimming. Plaintiff's complaint alleges gross negligence, and an alleged failure to properly screen, train, and supervise City employees. The case is assigned to Oakland County Circuit Court Judge Daniel O'Brien. As its first responsive pleading, the City filed a motion for dismissal, arguing that Plaintiff had failed to assert a viable claim against the City. This motion is pending before the Court. The Court denied the City's motion, and the City immediately filed a claim of appeal with the Michigan Court of Appeals, challenging the denial of

governmental immunity. A timely brief on appeal will be filed once the Court issues a briefing schedule. The City's brief on appeal is due February 7, 2019. A timely brief on appeal was filed by the City of Troy Defendants. Plaintiff's brief on appeal is expected to be filed by April 12, 2019. The briefs have been submitted, and the parties are waiting for the Court to schedule oral argument. Oral argument was held on December 6, 2019 in the Court of Appeals. On December 17, 2019, the Court issued an Opinion and Order reversing the trial court's decision, agreeing with the City that summary disposition should have been granted to the City of Troy and the individually named Troy defendants. The Court, however, remanded the case to the trial court, allowing Plaintiff an opportunity to seek leave to amend her Complaint. Plaintiff filed an application for leave to appeal with the Michigan Supreme Court. The parties anticipate that oral argument will be scheduled for March or April 2021. The Michigan Supreme Court did not schedule this matter for its March, April, or May docket, so the parties are hoping that oral argument on the application will happen in June 2021. The parties are still waiting for the Michigan Supreme Court to schedule oral argument in this matter. The Michigan Supreme Court scheduled oral arguments for November 9. The Supreme Court issued its opinion, remanding this case back to the Oakland County Circuit Court for a decision consistent with part of the Court of Appeals' decision. Plaintiff filed a motion in Oakland County Circuit Court to lift the stay entered in this matter which was granted by the Court on March 23, 2022. Subsequently, Plaintiff filed a motion seeking leave to file an amended Complaint in this matter. The City filed a motion opposing this request. The Court will hear oral argument on this motion on April 20, 2022. On April 20, 2022, the Court denied plaintiff's motion seeking leave to amend the Complaint, dismissing the case. Plaintiff filed an appeal of this decision. Plaintiff filed a motion to extend the time for filing the brief on appeal with the Court of Appeals, and then timely filed her appellate brief on September 23, 2022. The City will file a timely Brief on Appeal. The City timely filed its Brief on Appeal, and the parties are waiting for the Court of Appeals to schedule oral argument. The Court of Appeals scheduled oral argument for May 2, 2023. The Court of Appeals reversed the lower court's decision and remanded the case to the Oakland County Circuit Court to permit Plaintiff to file an Amended Complaint. On July 27, 2023, Plaintiff filed a Motion to Lift the Stay in the case. Plaintiff then filed another amended complaint on September 28, 2023. The Court re-opened the case, but there has been a delay in entering the Court order memorializing this action. There is a hearing scheduled for April 3, 2024 on Plaintiff's motion to lift the stay and file an amended complaint against the individual defendants only. The trial court lifted the stay in this matter and the parties have filed their Answers to the Complaint and are proceeding with discovery. The discovery phase continues in this case. The parties are continuing with the discovery process. **The parties have continued with discovery, including but not limited to taking depositions.**

F. MISCELLANEOUS CASES

1. **Michigan Association of Home Builders; Associated Builders and Contractors of Michigan; and Michigan Plumbing and Mechanical Contractors Association v. City of Troy** - The Plaintiffs filed a complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief in the Oakland County Circuit. On the date of filing the Plaintiffs also filed a Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Order to Show Cause. The Plaintiffs allege that the City of Troy has violated Section 22 of Michigan's Stille-DeRossett Hale Single State Construction Code Act by collecting fees for building department services that are not reasonably related to the cost of providing building department services. They are

alleging that the City of Troy has illegally entered into a contract with Safe Built of Michigan, Inc. for building services that provides that 20% of each building permit fee be returned to the City to cover services that are not “reasonably related to the cost of building department services,” as required by state statute. The Plaintiffs also assert a violation of the Headlee Amendment, arguing that the 20% returned to the City is a disguised tax that was not approved by voters. The Plaintiffs are asking for a declaratory judgment, as well as a return of any “surplus” building department service funds collected to date. Plaintiffs also request an order requiring the City to reduce its building department fees. The City of Troy was served with the Complaint and the Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Order for Show Cause on Wednesday, December 15, 2010. The parties were required to appear at Court on Wednesday, December 22, 2010, but the Court did not take any action at that time. Instead, the Court adjourned the matter to January 19, 2011. In the interim, the parties may engage in preliminary discovery in an attempt to resolve this matter. The parties are conducting discovery. The parties have completed discovery. Trial in this matter is scheduled for January 30, 2012. After being presented with motions for summary disposition, the Court ordered the parties to engage in mediation with a neutral municipal audit professional. Financial documents concerning this case are now being reviewed by an independent CPA. It is expected that the April 19, 2012 trial date will be postponed until after this review is complete. Mediation was unsuccessful in resolving this case, and therefore the Court is expected to issue an order on the pending Summary Disposition Motions. The trial date has been adjourned. On November 13, 2012, Oakland County Circuit Court Judge Shalina Kumar issued her order in favor of the City, and dismissed this case. Plaintiffs filed an appeal, which is now pending in the Michigan Court of Appeals. Appellant’s brief is expected to be filed soon. The parties timely filed their appellate briefs, and are now waiting for the Court of Appeals to schedule a date for oral argument. The Court of Appeals has not yet scheduled oral argument for this case. The parties are still waiting for a date for oral argument. Oral argument was held on March 4, 2014. On March 13, 2014, the Court of Appeals issued its opinion ruling in the City’s favor and affirming the Circuit Court’s decision dismissing the case. On April 23, 2014, Plaintiff Home Builders filed an Application for Leave to Appeal with the Michigan Supreme Court. Troy’s response was filed on May 19, 2014. The Michigan Supreme Court considered the application for leave to appeal and ordered that the matter be scheduled for oral argument. The Court also permitted the parties to submit supplemental briefs, which are due October 29, 2014. The City timely filed its supplemental brief with the Michigan Supreme Court. The parties are now waiting for the Court to set a date for oral argument on the application. The Michigan Supreme Court entertained oral arguments on the application for leave to appeal on March 11, 2015. On June 4, 2015, the Michigan Supreme Court reversed the decisions of the Court of Appeals and the Circuit Court and ruled there was no requirement for Plaintiffs to exhaust their administrative remedies. The case was remanded to Circuit Court for further proceedings. A status conference was held on June 18, 2015 with Judge Kumar. During the status conference, Judge Kumar scheduled a hearing for September 2, 2015, allowing the parties to address the issues that were previously raised in the motion for summary disposition but were not decided since the case was initially dismissed for failure to exhaust administrative remedies. At the hearing on September 2, 2015, Judge Kumar allowed Plaintiffs to request additional discovery within 30 days. Thereafter, both parties are allowed to file supplemental briefs. Supplemental briefs have been filed and we are awaiting a decision. On February 5, 2015, Judge Kumar issued her opinion and order ruling in favor of the City and dismissing the case. Plaintiffs filed a

Claim of Appeal with the Michigan Court of Appeals on February 23, 2016. The Plaintiffs and the City have both filed appellate briefs. Based on our request, the Michigan Municipal League Legal Defense Fund, Public Corporations Section of the State Bar of Michigan, Michigan Townships Association and also Safe Built have filed a motion asking for permission to file amicus briefs supporting the City's position. The Michigan Association of Realtors has sought permission to file an amicus brief supporting Plaintiffs' position. The Plaintiffs filed a reply brief. We are waiting for the Court of Appeals to rule on the motions for amicus briefs and to schedule a date for oral argument. Oral argument has not yet been scheduled. The parties presented oral arguments on September 7, 2017. On September 28, 2017, the Court of Appeals entered a two to one decision affirming the Circuit Court's grant of summary disposition in favor of the City. The Plaintiffs have filed an application for leave to appeal to the Michigan Supreme Court. The City timely filed an answer to the application. Additionally, the Michigan Municipal League's Legal Defense Fund, the Government Law Section of the State Bar of Michigan, and the Michigan Townships Association filed a motion to file an amicus curiae brief with the Supreme Court, supporting the City's position and asking for a denial of the application for leave to appeal. The Court granted the request for MML's amicus brief on January 5, 2018, and the brief was accepted for filing. The Michigan Realtor's Association filed a motion to file an amicus brief on behalf of Plaintiff Home Builders on February 23, 2018. On June 20, 2018, the Michigan Supreme Court entered an order granting the Michigan Realtor's Association's motion to file a brief amicus curiae. The Court also ordered that oral arguments be scheduled on Plaintiff's application for leave to appeal, and established a schedule for submitting supplemental written briefs. The Court accepted an amicus brief from the Michigan Health and Hospital Association and the Michigan Society of Association Executives, which was drafted by the attorney representing the Home Builders. The parties are now waiting for the Supreme Court to schedule oral argument. On December 19, 2018, the Michigan Manufacturers Association filed a motion to file a brief amicus curiae, and attached its proposed brief to the motion. On December 21, 2018, the Supreme Court granted the motion and accepted the brief that was submitted on December 19, 2018 for filing. The Michigan Supreme Court presided over the oral argument on March 7, 2019. After oral argument, the Court granted a motion to file a late amicus curiae brief. The City filed a response seeking to address the arguments raised in that brief and attached a proposed response. On April 5, 2019, the Court granted the City's motion to file a response to the amicus curiae brief and accepted the City's response for filing. The parties are now waiting for the Supreme Court to issue its opinion. On July 11, 2019, the Michigan Supreme Court entered its decision holding that the use of the revenue generated by the City's building inspection fees to pay the Building Department's budgetary shortfalls in previous year's violates the State Construction Code Act. The Court reversed the decisions of the Court of Appeals and the Circuit Court and remanded the case back to the Circuit Court for further proceedings. On remand the City can still present evidence to justify the retention of a portion of the fees. The Court permitted additional discovery, as requested by Plaintiff, and the City has responded to the numerous discovery requests. The Plaintiffs sought additional discovery, which the City objected to. The Plaintiffs then filed a motion to compel additional discovery and the City filed a response to the motion. The parties resolved the motion without a hearing with a stipulated order in which the City agreed to provide some additional information, which has now been provided. The Plaintiffs have now indicated they would like to take some depositions. Because of the Emergency Declaration, and the difficulty in conducting depositions, Plaintiff filed a motion to extend the discovery deadline, and the City has not objected

to this Motion. The Court has scheduled a new trial date. Plaintiffs filed a motion for summary disposition. The Court issued a scheduling order, requiring the City to respond on or before November 18, 2020, and scheduling the hearing for December 2. Oral argument was held on the summary disposition motion on December 2nd. We are awaiting a decision from the Court. The Court granted Plaintiffs' motion to file supplemental information. Plaintiffs then filed a supplementary brief, and the City filed its response. We are awaiting a decision by the Court on the summary disposition motion. On May 26, 2021, the Court entered its opinion and order denying both requests for summary disposition. The Court ruled that the Michigan Association of Home Builders had standing to pursue a claim under the Headlee Amendment but it dismissed the Headlee Amendment claims of Associated Builders and Contractors of Michigan and Michigan Plumbing and Mechanical Contractors Association on the basis those Plaintiffs did not establish standing. The case will now proceed to trial unless otherwise resolved through facilitation. The Court has scheduled a status conference for June 30th. The Court ordered facilitation, which was unsuccessfully accomplished on September 15, 2021. The Court also allowed the Plaintiff to take a late deposition of the City's Chief Financial Officer Rob Maleszyk, who was not employed during by the City prior to the discovery cut-off date. The case will now proceed to trial, and the Court has scheduled a status conference for October 19, 2021. The Court adjourned the status conference to November 2, 2021 and subsequently adjourned it to January 14, 2022. The case was re-assigned to visiting Judge Sosnick since Judge Kumar was appointed to serve as a Judge in Federal Court. The status conference was then adjourned to March 1, 2022. However, the case was then re-assigned to the newly appointed Judge Cohen and the status conference was rescheduled for April 5, 2022. On April 5, 2022, Judge Cohen held a status conference, and he scheduled trial for August 2, 2022. The trial commenced on August 2, 2022 and the testimony was concluded on August 3, 2022. Rather than hear closing arguments, the Court directed the parties to submit closing argument briefs within two weeks after a transcript of the testimony is prepared. The Court reporter has notified the parties the transcript will not be available until late October, 2022. The transcript of the trial was filed with the Court, and the parties were then required to simultaneously file written closing arguments, which were timely filed. Afterwards, the City filed a motion asking for permission to file a supplemental response to Plaintiff's closing argument and the Plaintiff opposed that motion. On November 30th, Judge Cohen granted the City's motion, and allowed Plaintiff to file a supplemental response too, and these were timely filed. We are now awaiting a decision from the Court. On February 2, 2023, Judge Cohen issued his opinion and order after bench trial. He found in favor of the Plaintiff on its Construction Code claim and enjoined the City from considering the work of non-building department employees in the calculation of building department expenses when determining what to charge for building permits. However, the Court ruled in favor of the City on Plaintiff's Headlee Amendment claim and ruled the Plaintiff did not establish standing and dismissed that claim. Plaintiff then filed a motion to amend the judgment or for a new trial, and the City responded. The trial Court denied Plaintiff's motion. On March 2, 2023, Plaintiff filed a claim of Appeal in the Michigan Court of Appeals appealing Judge Cohen's decision to dismiss Plaintiff's Headlee Amendment Claim and his denial of the motion to amend judgment. On March 9, 2023, the City filed a Claim of Cross Appeal appealing the previous decision of Judge Kumar denying the City's request for summary disposition and Judge Cohen's decision finding in favor of Plaintiff on the Construction Code claim. On July 3, 2023, the City filed its Brief on Cross Appeal. On July 28, 2023, the Plaintiff filed its Appellate Brief. On August 2, 2023, the Plaintiff filed its Brief in Response to the City's Cross Appeal. On August 23, 2023, the City filed its

Reply to Plaintiff's Response to the City's Cross Appeal. The City filed its Appellee Brief on September 1, 2023 and Plaintiff filed its Reply on September 15, 2023. The parties are now waiting for the Court of Appeals to schedule oral argument. The parties are still waiting for the Court to schedule oral argument. The Michigan Court of Appeals has scheduled oral argument for July 11, 2024. After oral argument, the parties are waiting for the Court of Appeals to issue its opinion. On October 16, 2024, the Michigan Court of Appeals issued an opinion affirming the Circuit Court decision in favor of Plaintiff on the Construction Code Claim, reversing the decision on the Headlee Amendment claim, and remanding the case back to the Circuit Court for judgment in favor of Plaintiff. On November 27, 2024, the City filed an Application for Leave to Appeal to the Michigan Supreme Court and the Plaintiff timely responded. **On January 2, 2025, the Michigan Supreme Court granted the joint motion of the Michigan Municipal League and the Government Law Section of the State Bar of Michigan to file an amicus curiae brief, which was submitted and supported the City's position. The City also timely filed a Reply to Plaintiff's Response to the Application for Leave to Appeal.**

2. **Scott Stoglin, John Milliron, Peter Dungjen & Joel Barthlow v. Troy.** Stoglin, Milliron, Dungjen and Barthlow are retired volunteer firefighters who filed a Freedom of Information Act request, seeking information pertaining to the required closure of the Voluntary Fire Fighter Incentive Plan and the benefits they received. There was a partial denial, since some of the requested information is protected from disclosure, and Plaintiffs filed this lawsuit challenging that determination. A motion for summary disposition was filed on July 9, 2024, and oral argument was initially scheduled for August 14, 2024, and adjourned to September 25, 2024. The Court waived oral argument and will issue an opinion on the City's motion. The parties are still waiting for the Court to issue its opinion, and in the meantime timely submitted witness lists and exhibit lists. The City also timely responded to Plaintiffs' discovery requests. The parties are now preparing for a bench trial, which is scheduled to start on February 24, 2025. **Plaintiffs filed a Motion to Compel Discovery, which was opposed by the City. The Court denied Plaintiff's motion to compel discovery on February 13, 2025. Approximately two weeks later, on February 25, 2025, the Court issued an order granting the City's motion for summary disposition. This case is now concluded.**
3. **Sullivan v Troy Police Department.** This is a claim and delivery action assigned to Judge Hartig in the 52-4 District Court. The Plaintiff was seeking the return of a pistol that was confiscated from her 14-year-old son, who was charged with a juvenile offense for unlawfully possessing a concealed weapon. Plaintiff's motion seeking immediate possession of the firearms was scheduled for June 26, 2024. The City filed a response to the motion. Plaintiff failed to appear for the hearing and as a result, Plaintiff's motion for immediate possession was denied. There has not been any additional action to date. **The Court administratively closed and dismissed the case. This case is now concluded.**
4. **Murphy v Troy Police Department.** This is a claim and delivery action assigned to Judge Hartig in the 52-4 District Court. Plaintiff is seeking the return of several firearms and ammunition. The Troy Police Department confiscated a gun and ammunition when Plaintiff was arrested for operating while under the influence of liquor and for unlawful possession of a dangerous weapon. Plaintiff had other guns at home, which were later turned over as a bond condition. Plaintiff's motion seeking immediate

possession of the firearms and ammunition is scheduled for January 8, 2025. The City has filed a response to the motion. **On January 8, 2025, the Court adjourned the case to allow the parties to discuss a possible resolution. On January 29, 2025, the Court again adjourned the case, and the parties continued to discuss a possible resolution. On February 27, 2025, the Court entered a final order, allowing the firearms to be returned to third parties. This case is now concluded.**

5. **White v Troy Police Department.** This is a claim and delivery action assigned to Judge Hartig in the 52-4 District Court. Plaintiffs are seeking the return of two pistols that were turned over to the Troy Police Department as a condition of bond in connection with a charge of domestic assault against the Plaintiffs' son. Plaintiffs' motion seeking immediate possession of the firearms is scheduled for January 29, 2025. **The City has filed an answer to the complaint and to the motion seeking immediate possession. On January 17, 2025 an order was entered allowing the firearms to be returned to a federally licensed firearms dealer. This case is now concluded.**

6. **Orzechowski v Troy Police Department.** This claim and delivery action was assigned to Judge Hartig in the 52-4 District Court. Plaintiff seeks the return of two pistols and three rifles that were turned over to the Troy Police Department as a condition of a personal protection order. The City filed an answer to the complaint and opposing Plaintiff's motion seeking immediate possession. On March 26, 2025, the Court granted Plaintiff's motion and entered an order for the return of firearms. This case is now concluded.

7. **Chen v Troy Police Department.** This is a claim and delivery action assigned to Judge Hartig in the 52-4 District Court. Plaintiff seeks the return of multiple firearms that were turned over to the Troy Police Department as a condition of bond when he was charged with 3rd degree child abuse. The City filed an answer to the complaint and opposed Plaintiff's motion seeking immediate possession. On April 2, 2025, the Court adjourned the Plaintiff's motion for two weeks to allow the Court more time to review the parties' briefs.

8. **Coleman v Troy Police Department.** This is a claim and delivery action assigned to Judge McGinnis in the 52-4 District Court. Plaintiff seeks the return of a pistol that was confiscated when he was arrested for operating a vehicle while intoxicated and possessing a concealed pistol while under the influence of alcohol. The City filed an answer to the complaint and Plaintiff's motion seeking immediate possession. The motion is scheduled for April 30, 2025.

G. CRIMINAL APPEALS/ DISTRICT COURT APPEALS

There are no current appeals from decisions of the 52-4 District Court in misdemeanor ordinance prosecution cases.

H. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS

The City Attorney's Office is working with the City Assessor in the following Tax Tribunal cases, where Property owners challenge the City Assessor's property valuation determinations or other determinations.

2023 CASES

Troy KS Development LLC, Case No. 23-001272

The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on July 18, 2023. The parties will commence the discovery process. The prehearing statement and valuation disclosure are due March 19, 2024. The parties agreed to an extension of time, which the Tribunal granted. The parties continue to exchange information. Petitioner filed a motion seeking to add the 2024 tax year to this pending case. The City filed a response concurring in the relief, and the Tribunal granted the motion. The parties timely filed the Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures for both 2023 and 2024 on June 20, 2024. The parties are now waiting for the Tax Tribunal Judge to schedule a trial date. The Tribunal has scheduled the trial date to start on June 9, 2025. **The Exhibit List and Proposed Exhibits for the scheduled trial are due on May 19, 2025.**

Troy KS Development LLC, Case No. 23-001274

The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on July 18, 2023. The parties will commence the discovery process. The prehearing statement and valuation disclosure are due March 19, 2024. The parties agreed to an extension of time, which the Tribunal granted. The parties continue to exchange information. Petitioner filed a motion seeking to add the 2024 tax year to this pending case. The City filed a response concurring in the relief, and the Tribunal granted the motion. The parties timely filed the Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures for both 2023 and 2024 on June 20, 2024. The parties are now waiting for the Tax Tribunal Judge to schedule a trial date. The Tribunal Judge scheduled the trial to start on June 13, 2025. **The Exhibit List and Proposed Exhibits for the scheduled trial are due on May 19, 2025.**

Troy Crossing LLC, Case No. 23-001405

The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on July 18, 2023. The parties will commence the discovery process. The prehearing statement and valuation disclosure are due April 4, 2024. The parties stipulated to an extension of time, which the Tribunal granted. The parties continue to exchange information. Respondent's Pre-Hearing Statement and Valuation Disclosure were timely filed on July 3, 2024. Petitioner also withdrew its appeal on one of the two parcels, which was affirmed on July 16, 2024. The Tribunal scheduled a prehearing conference for November 1, 2024. The Tribunal scheduled the trial date to start on March 24, 2025. **The parties negotiated a settlement, and stipulated to the entry of a consent judgment, which the Tribunal Judge approved on March 4, 2025. This case is now concluded.**

Timberland 5455, Case No. 23-001670

The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses. The parties will commence the discovery process. The City has been provided with some requested information. The prehearing statement and valuation disclosure are due June 4, 2024. The parties continue to exchange information. The parties timely filed the Valuation Disclosures and Pre-Hearing Statements on June 4, 2024. The parties are now waiting for the Tax Tribunal Judge to schedule a trial date. Trial is scheduled to start on January 27, 2025. **The parties negotiated a settlement, and stipulated to the entry of a**

consent judgment, which the Tribunal Judge approved on January 10, 2025. This case is now concluded.

Universal Property TMP LLC, Case No. 23-002023

The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on August 2, 2023. The parties will commence the discovery process. The prehearing statement and valuation disclosure are due July 5, 2024. Discovery continues. Petitioner requested an adjournment of the scheduling dates, and the City concurred in the request, which was submitted to the Tribunal. The Tribunal granted the requested adjournment. The parties timely filed Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures before the September 19, 2024 deadline. Petitioner filed a Motion to Dismiss the case in its favor, and the City filed its response. On November 22, 2024, the Tribunal entered its order denying Petitioner's motion. The case is now scheduled for a pre-hearing conference on January 21, 2025. The Tribunal scheduled the trial to begin May 28th, 2025. **The Exhibit List and Proposed Exhibits for trial are due on May 14, 2025.**

Quality Behavioral Health, Case No. 23-002182

The Tribunal dismissed the Petitioner's first two petitions for defects, but accepted the third petition, even though it also was defective. The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on November 13, 2023. The Tribunal scheduled a status conference for January 11, 2024. Subsequent to the status conference, the Tribunal entered a scheduling order for motions to be filed. On April 17, 2024, Petitioner filed a motion for summary judgment. The City timely responded on May 8, 2024. The parties are now waiting for a decision from the Tribunal on the pending motion. On August 16, 2024, the Court entered an order denying Petitioner's motion for summary disposition. **The Administrative Law Judge presided over the trial on February 11, 2025. The parties are now awaiting the Court's decision after the presentation of evidence and argument.**

Noor International Academy, Case No. 23-002393

The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on October 17, 2023. The parties will commence the discovery process. The prehearing statement and valuation disclosure are due July 5, 2024. The parties are preparing motions for summary disposition, based on the tax exemption dispute between the parties. Initial work has commenced on the summary disposition motion. The City continues to work on the summary disposition motion pleading, and also the Pre-Hearing Statement and Valuation Disclosure. The City timely filed its Pre-Hearing Statement on July 5, 2024. The Tribunal scheduled a prehearing conference for November 6, 2024. On October 30, 2024, Petitioner filed a Motion to Dismiss, and the City filed its Response on November 14, 2024. The Tribunal adjourned the prehearing conference until after it decides the motion. **On March 17, 2025 the Tribunal issued an Order granting the Petitioner's Motion for Summary Disposition, finding that Petitioner was entitled to a property tax exemption. This case is now concluded.**

Troy Westington, Case No. 23-002586

The City timely filed its Answer and Affirmative Defenses. The Prehearing Statement and Valuation Disclosure are due July 5, 2024. The parties have exchanged information and discovery. Petitioner filed a motion to add a challenge to the 2024 tax year to this case, and the City filed a response concurring in the requested relief. The Tribunal granted the motion. Petitioner requested an adjournment of the scheduling dates, and the City concurred in the request, which was submitted to the Tribunal. The Tribunal Judge granted the requested adjournment. The Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures are now due on October 7, 2024. The parties timely filed the pleadings. A

prehearing conference is scheduled for February 3, 2025. Trial is set to begin September 22, 2025. **The Exhibit List and Proposed Trial Exhibits are due on September 8, 2025.**

Akm Hasan, Case No. 23-002734

Petitioner was defaulted in this case, but the Tribunal entered an order reinstating the case on November 30, 2023. Petitioner has not yet taken any further action on this case. Petitioner has not yet taken any action to comply with the Tribunal's order. There has not been any new development in this case. There have not been any new developments. **This case was administratively closed.**

2024 Cases

1401 Troy Associates, LP, Case No. 24-000795

This petition was timely filed prior to the May 31, 2024 deadline. The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on June 11, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The Tribunal set a March 4, 2025 deadline for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures. The parties are in the discovery phase. **The parties negotiated a settlement, and stipulated to the entry of a consent judgment, which the Tribunal Judge approved on February 28, 2025. This case is now concluded.**

Athens Plaza, LLC, Case No. 24-000951

This petition was filed prior to the May 31, 2024 deadline. The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on June 4, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The Tribunal set a February 18, 2025 deadline for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures. The parties are in the discovery phase. **The parties negotiated a settlement, and stipulated to the entry of a consent judgment, which the Tribunal Judge approved on February 25, 2025. This case is now concluded.**

Kilmer Plaza, LLC, Case No. 24-000796

This petition was filed prior to the May 31, 2024 deadline. The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on June 11, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The Tribunal set a February 18, 2025 deadline for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures. The parties are in the discovery phase. **The parties negotiated a settlement, and stipulated to the entry of a consent judgment, which the Tribunal Judge approved on January 28, 2025. This case is now concluded.**

Macomb Residential Opportunities, Case No. 24-001160

This petition was timely filed prior to the May 31, 2024 deadline. The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on May 16, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. Discovery requests were sent to Petitioner on July 11, 2024, and responses were timely received. The City filed a motion for summary disposition on December 26, 2024. **Petitioner filed a response to the City's motion and its own cross motion for summary disposition on January 16, 2025.**

Mich Troy Technology Inc., Case No. 24-002244

This case was filed prior to the May 31, 2024 deadline, and subsequently served on the City. The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on June 4, 2024. The parties will commence the

discovery process. The Tribunal set a February 3, 2025 deadline for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures. The parties are in the discovery phase. **The parties negotiated a settlement, and stipulated to entry of a consent judgment, which the Tribunal Judge approved on January 27, 2025. This case is now concluded.**

Northfield Point Retail, LLC, Case No. 24-000832

This case was filed prior to the May 31, 2024 deadline, and subsequently served on the City. The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on June 11, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The Tribunal set a March 4, 2025 deadline for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures. The parties are in the discovery phase. **As a result of negotiations, the parties agreed to file a Joint Motion to Dismiss, which was granted by the Tribunal on February 13, 2025. This case is now concluded.**

Pantero, Inc., Case No. 24-000933

This case was filed prior to the May 31, 2024 deadline, and subsequently served on the City. The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on June 4, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The Tribunal set a February 3, 2025 deadline for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures. The parties are in the discovery phase. **The parties negotiated a settlement, and stipulated to the entry of a consent judgment, which the Tribunal Judge approved on January 9, 2025. This case is now concluded.**

Saks Troy, LLC, Case No. 24-000561

This case was filed prior to the May 31, 2024 deadline, and subsequently served on the City. The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on June 4, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The Tribunal set a February 3, 2025 deadline for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures. The parties are in the discovery phase. **The parties negotiated a settlement, and stipulated to the entry of a consent judgment, which the Tribunal Judge approved on January 16, 2025. This case is now concluded.**

Somerset Place LLC and Frankel Associates, Case No. 24-000814

This case was filed prior to the May 31, 2024 deadline, and subsequently served on the City. The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on May 14, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The Tribunal set a January 17, 2025 deadline for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures. The parties are in the discovery phase. **On January 6, 2025, the parties jointly filed a motion to extend the prehearing call deadlines by 90 days. The Tribunal granted the motion and set a new deadline of April 21, 2025 for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures. The parties continued settlement negotiations, and Petitioner filed a Motion to Withdraw the Petition without costs or attorney fees, which the Tribunal granted on February 18, 2025. This case is now concluded.**

Troy Crossing, LLC, Case No. 24-000844

This case was filed prior to the May 31, 2024 deadline, and subsequently served on the City. The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on June 11, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The Tribunal set a March 4, 2025 deadline for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures. The parties are in the discovery phase. **The parties filed for a Joint Motion**

to Hold Case in Abeyance pending the resolution of the 2023 case between the same parties. (MTT Docket 23-001405).

Timberland 5545, Case No. 24-001350

This case was filed prior to the May 31, 2024 deadline, and subsequently served on the City. The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on June 24, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The parties are currently preparing for trial in the 2023 appeal. The prehearing statements and valuation disclosures are due May 6, 2025. **The parties initially sought and were granted extensions of time to allow for continued negotiations. The parties subsequently resolved the case, and filed a Joint Stipulation for Entry of Consent Judgment, which the Court granted. This case is now resolved and closed.**

MK Oakland Mall, Case No. 24-001352

This case was filed prior to the May 31, 2024 deadline, and subsequently served on the City. The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on June 24, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The Tribunal set an April 4, 2025 deadline for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures. The parties are in the discovery phase. **On March 17, the Tribunal granted the parties' joint motions to extend time. The Tribunal then set a June 20, 2025 deadline for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures to be filed. This matter is now placed on the October 16, 2025 trial docket.**

501 Stephenson, LLC, Case No. 24-001351

This case was filed prior to the May 31, 2024 deadline, and subsequently served on the City. The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on June 24, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The Tribunal set a April 4, 2025 deadline for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures. The parties are in the discovery phase. **The parties continued to negotiate a potential settlement. The Petitioner subsequently sought to withdraw this case without costs or attorney fees, and the City agreed. The case was dismissed on March 7, 2025.**

14 Mile/ John R Road Holdings LLC, Case No. 24-001354

This case was filed prior to the May 31, 2024 deadline, and subsequently served on the City. The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on June 24, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The prehearing statements and valuation disclosures are due April 4, 2025. **The parties submitted a Joint Motion to Extend Valuation Disclosures, which was granted by the Tribunal on March 6, 2025. The Tribunal then set an August 19, 2025 deadline for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures.**

Aevri Long Lake, LLC, Case No. 24-002043

This case was filed prior to the May 31, 2024 deadline, but not served on the City until July 1, 2024. The City timely filed its Answer and Affirmative Defenses on July 12, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The prehearing statements and valuation disclosures are due June 4, 2025. **The parties are continuing to negotiate a potential settlement.**

GLF TROY OFFICE LLC, Case No. 24-001631

This case was filed prior to the May 31, 2024 deadline, but not served on the City until July 3, 2024. The City timely filed its Answer and Affirmative Defenses on July 12, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The Tribunal set an April 21, 2025 deadline for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures. **The parties negotiated a settlement, and stipulated to the entry of a consent judgment, which the Tribunal Judge approved on January 29, 2025. This case is now concluded.**

GLF TROY OFFICE, LLC, Case No. 24-001633

This case was filed prior to the May 31, 2024 deadline, but not served on the City until July 3, 2024. The City timely filed its Answer and Affirmative Defenses on July 12, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The Tribunal set an April 21, 2025 deadline for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures. **The parties negotiated a settlement, and stipulated to the entry of a consent judgment, which the Tribunal Judge approved on January 28, 2025. This case is now concluded.**

SZR TROY ASSISTED LIVING, LLC, Case No. 24-001576

This case was filed prior to the May 31, 2024 deadline, but not served on the City until July 3, 2024. The City timely filed its Answer and Affirmative Defenses on July 12, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The Tribunal set an April 21, 2025 deadline for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures. **The parties continued to negotiate. Petitioner subsequently submitted a Motion to Withdraw without costs or attorney fees. This was approved by the Tribunal Judge on February 18, 2025. This case is now concluded.**

Macy's Retail Holdings, Case No. 24-001652

This case was filed prior to the May 31, 2024 deadline, but there was a delay in the service on the City. The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on August 23, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The Tribunal set an April 21, 2025 deadline for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures. **The parties continue to negotiate a proposed settlement, or in the alternative prepare for trial.**

CC Troy Associates II, LLC, Case No. 24-001862

The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on July 30th, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The Tribunal set a May 6, 2025 deadline for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures. **The parties negotiated a settlement, and stipulated to the entry of a consent judgment, which the Tribunal Judge approved on January 30, 2025. This case is now concluded.**

Atlantic Ave Holdings, LLC, Case No. 24-002470

The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on August 27th, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The prehearing statements and valuation disclosures are due June 20, 2025. **The parties continued to negotiate a possible settlement. Petitioner filed a Motion to Withdraw without costs or attorney fees, and the City had no objection. The parties are waiting for the Court to review the Motion.**

CC Troy Associates, LLC, Case No. 24-001866

The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on August 23rd, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The Tribunal set a May 6, 2025 deadline for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures. **The parties continued to talk about possible settlement, and agreed to submit a proposed consent judgment, which the Tribunal Judge approved on January 30, 2025. This case is now concluded.**

Troy Elite Properties, LLC, Case No. 24-001996

The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on August 27th, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The prehearing statements and valuation disclosures are due June 20, 2025. **The parties are continuing to negotiate a proposed settlement.**

Troy Lodging, LLC, Case No. 24-002033

The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on August 27th, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The prehearing statements and valuation disclosures are due May 20, 2025. **The attorney representing petitioner filed a Motion to Withdraw, which was granted by the Tribunal.**

Troy Sports Center, LLC, Case No. 24-002723

The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on August 27th, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The prehearing statements and valuation disclosures are due August 4, 2025. **The parties will initiate settlement discussions.**

Big Beaver Hospitality Group, LLC, Case No. 24-001585

The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on August 23rd, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The Tribunal set an April 21, 2025 deadline for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures. **The parties have entertained settlement discussions.**

Somerset Campus Holdings, LLC, Case No. 24-001541

The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on August 23rd, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The parties are in the discovery phase. **The parties have entertained settlement discussions.**

Woodbridge Sales & Engineering, Inc. Case No. 24-001600-TT

The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on August 27th, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The Tribunal set a May 6, 2025 deadline for Pre-Hearing Statements and Valuation Disclosures. **It is expected that the parties will discuss possible settlement or in the alternative prepare for trial.**

Flagstar Bank Case No. 24-001989

The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on September 18, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The prehearing statements and valuation disclosures are due June

4, 2025. **It is expected that the parties will discuss possible settlement or in the alternative prepare for trial.**

United States Steel Corp. No. 24-002135

The City was served with this appeal on September 24, 2024. The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses. The prehearing statements and valuation disclosures are due July 7, 2025. **It is expected that the parties will discuss possible settlement or in the alternative prepare for trial.**

HAP of Michigan/Henry Ford Health Systems No. 24-001931

The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on October 4th, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The prehearing statements and valuation disclosures are due July 21, 2025. **It is expected that the parties will discuss possible settlement or in the alternative prepare for trial.**

Cole Tov Investments No. 24-002107

The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on October 8, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The prehearing statements and valuation disclosures are due August 4, 2025. **It is expected that the parties will discuss possible settlement or in the alternative prepare for trial.**

Windemere Park of Troy Land Holdings No. 24-001954

The City timely filed its answer and affirmative defenses on October 8, 2024. The parties will commence the discovery process. The prehearing statements and valuation disclosures are November 4, 2025. **It is expected that the parties will discuss possible settlement or in the alternative prepare for trial.**

Edward Ross v. Troy-Our office is also handling another administrative case against the City, which has been filed with the State of Michigan Office of Administrative Hearings. This complaint, filed by Edward Ross, alleges unlawful political retaliation resulted in his termination as a volunteer firefighter. The City's answer to this complaint is due on or before August 23, 2024. The City timely filed a position statement and motion to dismiss, and Petitioner filed a response. The Administrative Law Judge granted the City leave to file a reply to Petitioner's response, which was timely submitted on September 25, 2025. The Administrative Law Judge initially scheduled a hearing for September 27, 2024, but this was subsequently adjourned to October 31, 2024. The Administrative Law Judge has taken the motion under advisement. In the meantime, the trial is tentatively set for March 25, 2025. **On March 25, 2025, the Administrative Law Judge presided over a day long hearing, where witnesses presented testimony. The Judge requested that the parties submit written closing arguments within 60 days.**

If you have any questions concerning these cases, please let us know.