

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

In re

CITY OF DETROIT, MICHIGAN,

Debtor.

Chapter 9

Case No. 13-53846

Hon. Steven W. Rhodes

**AMENDED AND RESTATED STIPULATION BY AND BETWEEN RONALD COOK  
AND THE CITY  
OF DETROIT REGARDING  
PETITION FOR ORDER LIFTING STAY FILED BY RONALD COOK**

This amended and restated stipulation regarding the Petition for Order Lifting Stay Filed by Ronald Cook (“Motion”) is entered into on this 20<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2013, by and between Ronald Cook (“Plaintiff”) and the City of Detroit, Michigan (the “City”).

1. On July 18, 2013 ("Petition Date"), the City commenced this case under chapter 9 of title 11 of the United States Code ("Bankruptcy Code").
2. Prior to the Petition Date, Plaintiff and the City were parties to litigation in Wayne County Circuit Court, Cases Nos. 11-010396 and 12-004823, involving a grievance filed by the Plaintiff arising out of a 2007 promotion process at the City of Detroit Water and Sewerage Department (“Litigation”). The Circuit Court entered an Order in Case No. 11-010396 on January 25, 2012, and dismissed Case No. 12-004823 on May 8, 2012. An appeal of both Circuit Court cases was taken by the Plaintiff to the Michigan Court of Appeals and the Court of Appeals consolidated the cases in an Order entered June 27, 2012.

3. On the Petition Date, the Litigation was pending before the Michigan Court of Appeals. The Appeal (defined below) was fully briefed by all parties and oral argument had been conducted. Nothing remained to be completed with respect to the Appeal other than the issuance of a decision by the Court.

4. Following the Petition Date, on August 26, 2013, the Plaintiff filed the Motion in this chapter 9 case. (Docket No. 630).

5. By the Motion, the Plaintiff seeks relief from the automatic stay of section 362 of the Bankruptcy Code ("Automatic Stay"), as made applicable in this chapter 9 case by sections 901 and 922 of the Bankruptcy Code, to, inter alia, allow the Michigan Court of Appeals to issue its ruling on Court of Appeals cases nos. 308561 and 310509. ("Appeal").

6. Plaintiff and the City have reached an agreement to modify the Automatic Stay to permit the Court of Appeals to issue its ruling but preclude any further action by the Plaintiff in the Litigation absent further order by the Court. Consequently, the Plaintiff and the City stipulate to the Court's execution and entry of the attached modified proposed Order Approving Stipulation by and between Ronald Cook and the City of Detroit Regarding Petition for Order Lifting Stay Filed by Ronald Cook.

7. Plaintiff and City previously filed a Stipulation by and Between Ronald Cook and the City of Detroit Regarding Petition for Order Lifting Stay filed by Ronald Cook on September 19, 2013 (Docket No. 951).

8. Plaintiff and the City have agreed to the attached modified proposed Order and request that the Court enter the same.

Dated: September 20, 2013

STIPULATED:

/s/ Rodger L. Webb

Rodger L. Webb (P33356)  
17000 West Ten Mile Road  
Goodman Acker Bldg., 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Southfield, MI 48075  
Tel: (248) 395-9750  
Fax: (248) 395-9760  
[rodger@weflaw.com](mailto:rodger@weflaw.com).

ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF

/s/ Stephen S. LaPlante

Jonathan S. Green (MI P33140)  
Stephen S. LaPlante (MI P48063)  
Eric D. Carlson (MI P60277)  
MILLER, CANFIELD, PADDOCK AND  
STONE, P.L.C.  
150 West Jefferson  
Suite 2500  
Detroit, Michigan 48226  
Telephone: (313) 963-6420  
Facsimile: (313) 496-7500  
[green@millercanfield.com](mailto:green@millercanfield.com)  
[laplante@millercanfield.com](mailto:laplante@millercanfield.com)  
[carlson@millercanfield.com](mailto:carlson@millercanfield.com)

David G. Heiman (OH 0038271)  
Heather Lennox (OH 0059649)  
JONES DAY  
North Point  
901 Lakeside Avenue  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone: (216) 586-3939  
Facsimile: (216) 579-0212  
[dgheiman@jonesday.com](mailto:dgheiman@jonesday.com)  
[hlennox@jonesday.com](mailto:hlennox@jonesday.com)

Bruce Bennett (CA 105430)  
JONES DAY  
555 South Flower Street  
Fiftieth Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: (213) 243-2382  
Facsimile: (213) 243-2539  
[bbennett@jonesday.com](mailto:bbennett@jonesday.com)

ATTORNEYS FOR THE CITY

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

In re

CITY OF DETROIT, MICHIGAN,

Debtor.

Chapter 9

Case No. 13-53846

Hon. Steven W. Rhodes

**STIPULATED ORDER MODIFYING THE AUTOMATIC STAY AND ADJOURNING  
THE DEADLINE FOR THE CITY OF DETROIT TO OBJECT  
OR OTHERWISE RESPOND TO THE  
PETITION FOR ORDER LIFTING STAY FILED BY RONALD COOK**

This matter came before the Court by stipulation (“Stipulation”) between Ronald Cook (“Plaintiff”) and the City of Detroit (“City”), with respect to Plaintiff’s Petition for Order Lifting Stay (“Motion”) described in the Stipulation; the parties have reached an agreement to address the issues raised in the Motion as provided for herein; and the Court being fully advised in the premises;

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the automatic stay is hereby modified for the limited purpose of permitting the Michigan Court of Appeals to issue its ruling in Court of Appeals case nos. 308561 and 310509 (“COA Decision”);

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the City shall have 14 days following Plaintiff’s counsel’s delivery of a copy of the entered COA Decision to counsel for the City via email ([Carlson@millercanfield.com](mailto:Carlson@millercanfield.com)) or fax (313-496-8452 Attn: Eric Carlson), to Object or otherwise respond to other relief sought in the Motion (“Objection”);

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Plaintiff shall have an opportunity to reply to any Objection filed by City in accordance with Local Bankruptcy Rule 9014(e);

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, notwithstanding the aforementioned modification to the automatic stay for the limited purpose of allowing the issuance of the COA Decision, the automatic stay shall stay in full force and effect with respect to Plaintiff and all other issues addressed and relief requested in the Motion, including, without limitation, enforcement or implementation of the COA Decision, until such time as the Court enters further orders on the Motion.