

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF CLAIMS

PLANNED PARENTHOOD OF MICHIGAN, on
behalf of itself, its physicians and staff, and its
patients, and SARAH WALLET, M.D., M.P.H.,
FACOG, on her own behalf and on behalf of her
patients,

Plaintiffs,

v

Case No. 22-000044-MM

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN, in her official capacity,

Hon. Elizabeth L. Gleicher

Defendant,

and

MICHIGAN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
and MICHIGAN SENATE,

Intervening Defendants.

_____ /

**ORDER DENYING INTERVENING DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION**

Pending before the Court is a motion filed by Intervening Defendants Michigan House of Representatives and Michigan Senate seeking reconsideration of this Court's May 17, 2022 Opinion and Order granting a preliminary injunction enjoining defendant Attorney General and those under her control and supervision from enforcing MCL 750.14 during the pendency of this case. Intervening defendants' motion for reconsideration is DENIED.


To warrant reconsideration, the moving parties must demonstrate "a palpable error by which the court and the parties have been misled and show that a different disposition of the motion must result from correction of the error." MCL 2.119(F)(3). Intervening defendants have not sustained this burden.

Intervening defendants raise two arguments in support of reconsideration: that this Court's jurisdictional finding and analysis were flawed, and that the Court improperly and erroneously weighed the applicable preliminary injunction factors. As to both arguments,

Intervening Defendants have failed to demonstrate that this Court was in any respect “misled” by the arguments of the original parties. Nor have intervening parties supported that the Court committed “a palpable error.” Rather, intervening defendants rely on precisely the same arguments advanced by amicus curiae Michigan Right to Life and Michigan Catholic Conference. The Court analyzed and rejected these arguments in its May 17, 2022 opinion, and detects no palpable error. Further, intervening defendants’ justiciability arguments are now moot, given the presence in this litigation of the intervening defendants, whose interests are demonstrably adverse to those of the plaintiff.

For these reasons, intervening defendants’ motion for reconsideration is DENIED. This is not a final order and does not close the case.

Date: June 15, 2022



Elizabeth Gleicher
Judge, Court of Claims