## EXHIBIT 5

1	STATE OF MICHIGAN
2	30TH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF INGHAM CIVIL DIVISION
3	
4	GRACIE WEBSTER and VERONICA THOMAS,
5	Plaintiffs,
6	v Case No. 13-734-CZ Hon. Rosemarie Aquilina
7	THE STATE OF MICHIGAN; RICHARD SNYDER, as Governor of the State
8	of Michigan; and ANDY DILLON, as Treasurer of the State of
9	Michigan, Defendants.
10	ROBBIE FLOWERS, MICHAEL WELLS,
11	JANET WHITSON, MARY WASHINGTON, and BRUCE GOLDMAN,
12	Plaintiffs,
13	v Case No. 13-729-CZ Hon. Rosemarie Aquilina
14	RICK SNYDER, as the Governor of the State of Michigan; ANDY DILLON, as
15	the Treasurer of the State of Michigan; and the STATE OF MICHIGAN,
16	Defendants.
17	/
18	MOTION TO AMEND PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
19	MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT
20	MOTION FOR SUMMARY DISPOSITION
21	BEFORE THE HON. ROSEMARIE AQUILINA, CIRCUIT JUDGE
22	Ingham County, Michigan - Friday, July 19, 2013
23	
24	
25	

1	APPEARANCES:	
2		
3		, et al.: JOHN R. CANZANO (P30417) Smith & Radtke, PC
4	4	400 Galleria Officentre, Ste. 117 Southfield, MI 48034
5	For Plaintiffs Flowers	
6	Ţ	WILLIAM A. WERTHEIMER (P26275) Attorney at Law
7		30515 Timberbrook Lane Bingham Farms, MI 48025
8	For State Defendants:	
9	ŗ	THOMAS QUASARANO (P27982) BRIAN DEVLIN (P34685)
10	Ž.	Assistant Attorney General State Operations Division
11	1	P.O. Box 30754 Lansing, MI 48909
12	•	24.101.107.03
13		
14	REPORTED BY:	Melinda I. Dexter, RMR, RPR, CSR-4629
15		Official Court Reporter 313 W. Kalamazoo
16	1	Post Office Box 40771 Lansing, MI 48901-7971
17		Dansing, Mi 40501 /5/1
18		
19		
20		YII
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

```
TABLE OF CONTENTS
1
2
5
       WITNESSES:
            None
7
9
10
11
   EXHIBITS:
12
           None
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

whatever the Court's preference would be. Ingham County, Michigan THE COURT: Well, I'm going to sign this, and I 2 Friday, July 19, 2013 - At 11:25 a.m. 2 haven't compared the two. I think we probably should THE COURT: Okay. All right. Robert Flowers, 3 call it an amended order. Michael Wells, Janet Whitson, Mary Washington, and Bruce 4 4 MR, WERTHEIMER: Okay. Goldman versus Rick Snyder, as the Governor of the State 5 THE COURT: But let me just say that your stay of Michigan; Andy Dillon, as the Treasurer of the State 6 6 7 is denied. of Michigan; and the State of Michigan, Docket 13-729-CZ. MR. QUASARANO: Thank you, your Honor. Counsel, your appearance for the record. 8 8 9 MR. WERTHEIMER: William Wertheimer, 9 Maybe --THE COURT: Counsel? your Honor, on behalf of Plaintiffs. 10 10 MR. CANZANO: Your Honor, John Canzano. I'm 11 MR. QUASARANO: Maybe doing another separate 11 order makes the most sense, and we can do that using the 12 not counsel in that case. I'm here on the Webster case. 12 forms provided by the Court. THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 13 13 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. MR. QUASARANO: Thomas Quasarano, Assistant 14 14 MR. QUASARANO: Thank you. Attorney General on behalf of the State Defendants. 15 15 16 MR. WERTHEIMER: Your Honor, one other thing 16 MR. DEVLIN: And Brian Devlin, Assistant that may be related to that, and that is, the order the 17 17 Attorney General. Court is entering, consistent with the order the Court 18 18 THE COURT: Thank you. entered yesterday, provides us with the relief that we 19 Counsel? 19 were seeking by our motion which was scheduled for MR, WERTHEIMER: Your Honor, Plaintiffs are 20 2.0 21 hearing Monday at 9 o'clock. here today in order to request that the Court enter 21 either a corrected or amended preliminary injunction 22 The Attorney General had also noticed a motion 22 to dismiss for Monday at 9 o'clock. It was not timely in 23 order. The Court, I'm sure, recalls the circumstances 23 the sense that he did not give the appropriate time 24 yesterday. We have had a chance to have your order 24 period for us to respond. In the reply brief I filed typed. We reviewed it. There were some mistakes in it. 25 yesterday, we objected to that and said that we did not For example, the heading still said temporary restraining agree to expedited. There was no order expediting and order from the other case where it was clear from the 2 suggested that the Court deny the -- their motion for 3 record and from the body, even, of the order that it was 3 a preliminary injunction. So we made that change. We 4 that reason, but I raise it now just to indicate that 4 typed everything. We put in the attorneys' names and the that also is out there and that maybe we want -- we want 5 5 6 another order dealing with that issue. case name. 6 7 Our position is that it's not timely and that We made a couple of other changes, which I have 7 it shouldn't be heard Monday in any event. I don't know indicated to the Court off the record on another copy of 8 whether the Attorney General intends to proceed on Monday 9 the injunctive order. And I would -- we would -- I'm 9 happy to go over each of those, if the Court needs. 10 on it. 10 Otherwise, I would request that the Court issue this 11 MR, QUASARANO: Your Honor, we do understand 11 that under MCR 2.119, the motion for summary disposition 12 preliminary injunction. I did not know whether the Court 12 is a 21-day period. We sought stipulation of counsel. would want to refer to it as corrected, amended, or not 13 13 They were kind enough to look at the briefs first to refer to it at all. So I left that blank. But we would 14 14 decide whether they would stipulate. They chose not to. ask that the Court enter the order that we presented 15 15 We also sought the endorsement on our notice of 16 today to conform to the Court's ruling yesterday. 16 17 hearing from the Court to allow the hearing on Monday. THE COURT: Counsel? 17 Yesterday at bench we discussed if we needed to -- we MR. QUASARANO: Yes, your Honor. As your Honor 18 18 needed to set a hearing date on the dispositive motions. knows, we moved for a stay, and so I would ask either 19 19 that the stay that was denied yesterday be identified in 20 The Court is at liberty to have those heard today or on 2.0 Monday or at such other time. Our notice of hearing did the modified order, or we can present another stay. I 21 21

Entered 08/19/13 23:55 20 Le? Page 5 of 14

notice of hearing itself. Thanks.

say "or at such other time as the Court may order" on the

MR. CANZANO: Your Honor, if I could make a

22

23

24

would assume that the Court would not grant a stay of

25 13e5684625WenieDocv51926st @ileet108/109/13

this order consistent with yesterday. So either to identify it in this modified order as a stay was

22

23

that, or will you be amending that? THE COURT: Yes, sir. MR. QUASARANO: No. I'll speak for Mr. Devlin MR. CANZANO: We've -- we've presented a motion 2 2 here for a moment only. In the notice of hearing, we 3 this morning, an emergency motion, to advance the hearing indicated to advance it to that date because of all the on our motion for declaratory judgment that's set for other activities in this case or such other time as the Monday to today. It would be my intention to deal only 5 Court may order. with the declaratory judgment part of it today, not the 6 7 I do point out that in the Flowers case in the injunction part of it. And they've already -- they've prayer for relief is a reference to declaratory judgment. agreed that that can be expedited. I don't know that 8 they've agreed that it can be expedited to today, but Both cases are asking for both reliefs; preliminary and 9 9 declaratory judgment. Preliminary injunction motions they agree that it could be expedited to Monday. 10 10 So if -- that part of it, either today or 11 were granted. Our brief talks about the alternative, 11 assuming arguendo there were a filing, a Chapter 9 12 Monday, that would be a final declaratory judgment. My 12 filing, and then we go into the basis for why there are preference is to do it today. 13 grounds not to declare judgment, why there is some THE COURT: Is that correct? 14 14 jurisdictional grounds. MR. QUASARANO: Well, I believe under 2.605(D), 15 15 So I think that the brief is sufficiently 16 16 they can seek an expedited hearing, and certainly the adequate to address all of the issues that are still at 17 Court has the authority to issue that. I think by not 17 entertaining a dispositive motion, we're not going to issue in this case. Certainly there has been a factual 18 18 change and those factual changes don't need to be have a complete argument. Mr. Devlin will be arguing for 19 19 the State. But we do acknowledge what the court rule 20 addressed. 20 21 MR. WERTHEIMER: I guess I just would reiterate 21 says, that's correct. THE COURT: Well, are you objecting to having 22 if -- I need to know whether counsel is going forward on 22 Monday with its motion to dismiss. I still haven't heard 23 it heard today? 23 24 a yes or no. MR. QUASARANO: We will not object in the 24 25 THE COURT: His answer is yes, Counsel. interest of judicial economy. 25 10 8 MR. WERTHEIMER: Well, okay. If the answer is 1 THE COURT: And your motion deals with that 1 yes, I would just point out that it's clear under the 2 issue? rules that it is not timely; that no order has entered MR. QUASARANO: It's a (C)(8) motion that would 3 address whether there are grounds for a declaratory 4 from this Court. THE COURT: You're right. 5 judgment, yes. 5 THE COURT: Well, then --6 MR. WERTHEIMER: Okay. 6 7 THE COURT: You know what we're doing? We are 7 I'm sorry? under siege here. Well, we aren't; I'm not. Technically MR. WERTHEIMER: I'm sorry. I may be confused 8 I am through paper, but all of you are. Detroit is. The now. Their motion that they filed in the Flowers case to 9 9 State is. So I'm not going to go through the usual court dismiss deals with issues like ripeness. It's a (C)(4) 10 10 rules and the time and all of that. You are all going to 11 and (C)(8) motion. Many of the facts have changed. I 11 spend your weekend doing what lawyers do, and that's a would think they would want to refile that, in any event. 12 12 lot of homework because we're going to have that hearing 13 I mean, you know, to make an argument based on -- based 1.3 on ripeness given what happened yesterday afternoon seems Monday unless you're asking me to do it now. 14 14 I'm going to hear everything because we're not to me to be just, to use a lawyer's word, moot at this 15 15 going to piecemeal this. You all know the case. I know 16 point. But I'm concerned only with their motion to 16 dismiss in the Flowers case, not with anything related to the case. I've done the homework. I don't think myself 17 17 or my staff got any sleep last night. We've been doing Webster and whether we're to appear here Monday at 9 to 18 18 research. I bet if I called all of your wives and asked -- per their notice or whether they've withdrawn that 19 19 if you got any sleep, they'd be saying, "No. When is my 2.0 20 motion or not. husband going to get some sleep," right? So we're going 21 THE COURT: Okay. Well, let's deal with the 21 22 to have a hearing, and I don't care if it's today or 22 Flowers case. Monday. I'll come here Saturday, if you would like. I 23 What is your intention in regard to Monday? 23 don't care. Let's get some answers, let's get a bottom Are you still asking the Court to hear your motion? It 24 Entered 08/49/43123:55:20° the add of offere 25 13 45 88 4 6 eswired. Drog 05 194 6 skin Filter of 08 19/13

Flowers will apply to Webster as well. The fact that because that's where you all are headed. I don't care this case is now before the bankruptcy court means that what side you're on. Someone is going up, right? So I there is a court of competent jurisdiction that can hear have answers for you. Tell me your story. I've got the 3 many of the concerns of the Plaintiffs. And that fact solution. You might not like it. alone changes a lot of the ripeness arguments and things 5 Can we move on? that you will see. MR. QUASARANO: We're prepared to go today, or 6 Nonetheless, it is the position of the State we'll defer to brother counsel for Monday if more time is 7 that there has not been harm at this point to the 8 needed. Plaintiffs. 9 9 MR. WERTHEIMER: I'll go today. We can go 10 THE COURT: Sir, there hasn't been harm because right now, I mean. 10 they haven't acted. What we have here, and I would like THE COURT: Okay. I can go right now too. 1.1 11 you to get to the point, because -- and you can make your 12 12 How about you, sir? MR. CANZANO: I think we already agreed that 13 record. I'm a very patient judge. I think most people 13 will agree with that. But I have two very serious 14 Webster could go today. 14 concerns because there was this rush to bankruptcy court 15 15 MR. DEVLIN: Very well. that didn't have to occur and should not have occurred. THE COURT: We have an agreement. I think that 16 16 might be the only thing you all agree on. Hallelujah. And certainly Plaintiffs should not have been blind-17 17 sided, and this Court and this process should not have 18 MR. QUASARANO: Other than it's very hot 18 been ignored. 19 outside. 19 We have the Michigan Constitution Article IX, § 20 20 THE COURT: Yeah. We can agree on that too. 24 that forbids the Emergency Manager to file bankruptcy 21 21 Okay. if pension plans or retirement system of this State or 22 Counsel? Well, let's let these gentlemen enter 22 its political subdivisions are diminished or impaired. so we don't make noise for the court reporter before we 23 23 And the Constitution states: 24 24 proceed. The accrued financial benefits of 25 Anybody else need to make an appearance? 25 14 each pension plan and requirement 1 THE COURTROOM: (No verbal response.) 1 system of the state and its 2 THE COURT: No? Okay. 2 political subdivisions shall be a MR. CANZANO: Which case would you like to go 3 3 contractual obligation thereof first; Webster or Flowers? 4 4 which shall not be diminished or 5 5 THE COURT: Mr. -impaired. MR. WERTHEIMER: Well, he goes first on Flowers 6 6 And the bankruptcy court will be doing exactly because it's his motion, so it's not my --7 7 that in its reorganization because the pensions are an THE COURT: Okay. Whatever you'd like. 8 8 unsecured asset. And under the bankruptcy MR. DEVLIN: Thank you, your Honor. My name 9 9 reorganization, under a reorganization Chapter 9, there 10 is Brian Devlin, Assistant Attorney General. THE COURT REPORTER: Could you approach the 11 is no reaffirmation of debt. If I were doing a Chapter 7 11 and wanted to go in and reaffirm payments on my car, I 12 12 podium, please? could do so. But there is no way that you can go into THE COURT: Yeah. If everybody would speak 13 13 from the podium. The mikes work better. The court 14 bankruptcy court and say, "I am going to reaffirm the 14 pension so that we don't disrupt that." 15 reporter has better access to hear you. We'll make a 15 So what we're doing here is violating the better record, and obviously the Court of Appeals and the 16 16 Constitution. And then we have Michigan Complied Law Supreme Court will need your record, please. 17 17 MR. DEVLIN: Thank you, your Honor. Brian 18 141,1552, which precludes the Emergency Manager from 18 taking such actions. It states specifically in m -- (m) 19 Devlin appearing on behalf of the Defendants. 19 and (ii): As Mr. Quasarano has mentioned, that obviously 20 20 21 The emergency manager shall fully there's been a very dramatic change in circumstances 21 comply with the public employee since the brief was filed. The petition in bankruptcy 22 22 retirement system investment 23 has been filed as of yesterday. It changes some aspects 23 act -of this case from the State's perspective, but not all. 2.4 Entered 08/19/13 23:55:20 Page 7 of 14

that they have the power to address under 943, is just -- 1965 PA 314, and § 24 of that; it's just speculation. 2 Article IX of the State Constitution of 1963, and any 3 THE COURT: It's a certainty, sir. You filed 3 actions taken shall be consistent 4 with the pension fund's qualified 5 plan status under the federal 6 internal revenue code. So tell me, sir, how do you get into bankruptcy 8 court and not violate the Constitution of Michigan and 9 9 10 10 not violate how the Emergency Manager is supposed to operate? Haven't we jumped the gun? What are you doing 11 11 12 12 here, sir? MR. DEVLIN: I can understand your Honor's 13 13 concerns. The position of the State is that none of 14 14 15 15 these impairments have occurred yet. THE COURT: Only because the bankruptcy trustee 16 16 hasn't got his teeth into it. It will occur. It's 17 imminent, isn't it? Tell me how it's not imminent, sir? 18 18 19 MR. DEVLIN: I can't predict the future. 19 20 THE COURT: Yes, you can. 2.1 21 MR. DEVLIN: I cannot. 22 THE COURT: The bankruptcy court -- the 22 worked. bankruptcy court has a certain function. You're a 23 23 lawyer. You understand the function of the bankruptcy 24 24 court. That's why you ran there yesterday not slowly but 25 25 1 in your running shoes, right? MR. DEVLIN: I can't speak to that. I had 2 2 sir? nothing to do with it. But I can tell you about § 943 of 3 3 the Bankruptcy Code, which affords all of the protections 4 that we discussed in the brief that I've alluded to 5 today. 6 6 7 None of those injuries have occurred at this 7 8 point. For that reason, we believe the claim is still 8 speculative. Of course those are legitimate concerns, 9 9 but the court, the bankruptcy court can address them. 10 10 I referred to -- I'd also refer to Straus, the 11 11 case cited in our brief too. If that injury has not 12 12 occurred, as we contend, then it's an inappropriate 13 13 14 remedy that the Plaintiffs are asking for today. 14 THE COURT: Thank you. Now, obviously you and I don't see this injury 15 15 in quite the same terms, but that is the position of the 16 16 State. The injury has not occurred at this point. 17 17 THE COURT: That would be because the 18 18 19 bankruptcy judge has not sat at his bench like I have and 19 State's motion should be granted --20 heard the case and started the reorganization, and that's 20 the only reason. For me to believe what you're saying 21 THE COURT: Sir --21 22 would be -- would make me Helen Keller who's not yet 22 MR. DEVLIN: -- thank you. 23 23 learned the alphabet.

MR. DEVLIN: I think anything that you and I

25 **13**P**538**\$46\$\text{bswirthatDtocb51k946}cy \phitethat08/4r9\$13

24

in bankruptcy court, which is federal because you know that certainty. I don't know how you get around it because it's an unsecured asset that cannot be reaffirmed, and there is no case law, and you know that as well because all of us stayed up all night looking for case law, and there is no case law. You can't tell me that it can be segregated out and reaffirmed. So these people that have this pension where it is supposed to be protected under the Constitution and under the legislative intent under the emergency manager legislation, it cannot survive. It cannot survive federal bankruptcy, and I have no jurisdiction there, and you know that. And that's why everybody made us wait as -- slowly we were waiting for your office to come here out of courtesy. We waited so we would have both sides present, which is what we do. We honor civility, and it was filed in order to bind everybody so this could occur, and it's cheating, sir, and it's cheating good people who And so what's going to happen is we're not honoring the Constitution, we're not honoring the emergency manager legislation, and we're not honoring good citizens, and we're also not honoring the President who took Detroit out of bankruptcy. What are we doing, MR. DEVLIN: Your Honor, I understand what you're saying, but I would take exception to the motion that somehow the Attorney General's Office delayed or dragged its feet or in any way tampered with the proceedings yesterday. Now, I wasn't here. I wasn't part of them, but I don't believe that's the case. THE COURT: It looks that way, sir. If somehow that's not the case, I apologize, but it's the old saying if it looks like a duck, you know the rest. MR. DEVLIN: Well, I don't want to speculate on who did what yesterday. As I said, I wasn't here. MR. DEVLIN: But it is our position that until that injury occurs and in light of Straus, in light of the jurisdiction of the bankruptcy court, that this motion should be -- er, the motion is inappropriate. The THE COURT: Let me ask you this: If the injury occurs, isn't it then too late, much too late, way too Enteredf08/119/13/25:55:20re i Pade/80fix14

injury. The leg has been amputated, and we cannot fix 2 it. MR. DEVLIN: We don't know, is my position on 3 that. We don't know, and there is opportunity for this 4 very issue to be heard in the bankruptcy court. THE COURT: But there is no opportunity in the 6 bankruptcy court for them to fix the harm. Do you have any law that says the bankruptcy court can fix the 8 pension fund because I haven't found that either, and I've looked? 10 11 MR. DEVLIN: Again, I understand the pension fund to be tremendously under funded. There are many 12 problems here, far beyond what's gone on in the last 13 24 hours. But the court, the bankruptcy court does have 14 15 jurisdiction to hear these arguments, to note the Michigan Constitutional provisions, and to order what it 16 feels it must order. 17 18 THE COURT: Okay. 19 MR. DEVLIN: Thank you. 20 THE COURT: Thank you. 21 MR. WERTHEIMER: Your Honor, I'll be brief. 22 First, I would just point out to the Court that this is a

capacity to sue because apparently they're not being injured; and it's a claim that we have failed to state a

motion under C -- MCR 2.116(C)(4), (5), and (8): That

is, it's a claim that there is no jurisdiction over the

subject matter; it's a claim that my clients have no

23

24

25

3

4

10

11

13

14

15

17

18

19

21

22

claim.

As to the law relating to those three points, I 5 would rely upon the briefs that I have filed, including the reply brief that I filed yesterday in which I did 7 take the position that we should not hear -- that the Court should not hear the motion to dismiss but in which I dealt with all of those issues, and I won't repeat those arguments.

I would just point out a couple of things: 12 First of all, counsel says that he cannot predict the future. The Detroit Emergency Manager, who is a competent lawyer familiar with bankruptcy, has predicted the future, and we quoted him in our complaint as saying, essentially, that once he gets into bankruptcy, the constitutional rights of our clients will disappear, will be "trumped" in his words or in the words of the reporter quoting him. And I think that was -- there was an interview and there was also his statements made to the Detroit Free Press Editorial Board.

But the point being that the Detroit Emergency Manager has had no reluctance to predict the future, and 23 his prediction is consistent with our claim and with the

25 **13453846-54/19 m 1906 51906**rt's Piletip 08/19/13

just simply is not credible for an attorney for the Governor and the State Treasurer to come here today and say he can't predict the future when we indicated in our complaint that the future could be predicted.

I would also point out that since we were in 5 court yesterday, we now have not just the bankruptcy but filings related to that bankruptcy. I'm not going to introduce these documents, but I understand that counsel in the Webster case that will be argued when we're done 9 here will be introducing them. I would simply point out that we've got correspondence back and forth between the 11 Detroit Emergency Manager and the Governor requesting the 12 13 authorization and the Governor approving the 14 authorization, in which there is not a word mentioned 15 about Article IX, § 24 of the Michigan State

16 Constitution. 17 Our Governor does not feel that that's 18 relevant. He goes on for pages in his authorization, obviously for public relation's purposes, talking about 19 how deeply he cares about the city of Detroit, etcetera, 20 21 etcetera, but not one word about Article IX, § 24 of the Constitution. And, of course, no such word from Mr. Orr 22 23 in his request to the Governor.

So counsel's essentially saying "No harm yet. 24 Don't worry. Maybe bankruptcy court will take care of

it." But the people who are taking it into bankruptcy, have taken it into bankruptcy have made very clear they're not going to take care of it in bankruptcy. And finally just the obvious point, but I think 4 needs to be reiterated with all the flurry going on that

10

the whole point of injunctive relief is to prevent a harm that has not yet occurred, and that's all we're seeking with our overall lawsuit and all we were seeking with our motion for preliminary injunction, which this Court has already granted. Thank you.

11 MR. QUASARANO: Your Honor, I think that the State's briefing and argument sufficiently presents the 12 State's position, but I know the Court is patient, and I 13 would ask the Court's indulgence on the one matter of my appearance here yesterday, and I would like to make this 15 16 clear for the record, if I may, but for Mr. Wertheimer, who is counsel for the Flowers and others case, I would 17 18 not have known that the General Retirement System of the City of Detroit, et al., even had a TRO motion scheduled. 19

The only communication I had with counsel for 20 that, those Plaintiffs, was the night before asking if we could accept service on the Governor, which, as the Court 22 knows, we're barred from accepting service on behalf of a 23

State Defendant. Until the State Defendant is served, we

Entered 98/19/13 23:55:20coup & der 9 8 14

The opposing party has failed to I was told there would not be any preliminary state a claim on which relief can injunction or TRO sought in that case. I do understand 2 2 that situation had changed in the hours after that. But, 3 be granted. but for Mr. Wertheimer calling me, counsel in another I see problems all over the place. I stated them. I don't think I need to be redundant. Clearly case, I would not have known. When he called me, and the there are numerous claims and issues. I won't be transcript yesterday says it was around 3:30 or so, and then I arrived as quickly as I could walk over here. So redundant. The relief requested is denied. Motion for 7 summary disposition is denied. there was no delay on behalf of the Attorney General's MR. WERTHEIMER: Thank you, your Honor. 9 Office to be here, to represent the State's interest, to be here to answer this Court's questions. And any delay 10 THE COURT: Who's preparing the order? 10 MR. QUASARANO: I'll be preparing it for you, 11 at all was because we were notified by counsel for the 11 Judge. Plaintiffs yesterday that they intended to bring the 12 12 motion. Thank you for letting me clarify that. 13 THE COURT: Thank you, very much, sir. 13 14 THE COURT: Thank you. 14 MR. QUASARANO: Thank you. 15 THE COURT: Next matter? 15 Anything further, sir? MR. WERTHEIMER: We are -- I am done relative 16 16 MR. DEVLIN: Nothing further. Thank you. THE COURT: Defendants have filed a motion for 17 to the Flowers case. 17 THE COURT: Thank you, very much, sir. summary disposition pursuant to (4), which is: 18 18 MR. WERTHEIMER: I'll vacate. I think there 19 19 The Court lacks jurisdiction of are others lawyers in the room with another related case. the subject matter. 20 20 21 This Court absolutely has jurisdiction of the So I'll wait in the courtroom but vacate counsel table. 22 THE COURT: Thank you. 22 subject matter. It's a state question. I know they've 23 MR. WERTHEIMER: Thank you. removed it to federal bankruptcy court, but we still have 23 24 MR. CANZANO: Your Honor, John Canzano on 24 very serious state questions. We have the State behalf of the Plaintiffs in the Webster case. I would Constitution, Article IX, § 24. We have an emergency 25 25 manager statute, and we have a Constitution at issue. like to clarify the relief that we are seeking here today. We -- our complaint sought declaratory judgment State issues are within the purview of this Court. I and preliminary injunction. Today we are seeking only a don't care that it was removed to bankruptcy court. declaratory judgment. 4 There is nothing here that tells me it was properly 4 5 I have taken the liberty of preparing an order 5 removed to federal bankruptcy court because there is a for declaratory judgment which I can present when I'm procedure in place of how it gets removed. And this 6 7 Court does not believe it was properly placed in the 7 done, and the Court may or may not want to say everything that I've said in there, but I think we are entitled to hands of the bankruptcy court because it is going to 8 8 that relief. The briefs -- this has all been briefed affect pensions. Once it affects pensions, which is 9 9 already. I don't need to go over that. clearly what it's going to do, it's in violation, and the 10 10 11 Governor can't give permission for it to go to bankruptcy 11 The State's defense to our motion did not contest the facts and did not contest the substance of court. It's very clear. I think a first-year law 12 12 13 the merits of the law, which is that the Constitution student understands the concept. And I know the Governor is not a lawyer, but he has very well paid lawyers who do 14 prohibits diminishment of pension -- accrued pension 14 benefits. They simply -- they simply said the case is 15 15 understand the concept. not ripe, and there is not an actual controversy for a 16 16 The party asserting the claim 17 declaratory judgment. lacks the legal capacity to sue. 17 That is MCR 2.116(5). A party asserting the 18 Now, after yesterday, it's obviously ripe. We 18 cited a case in our reply brief, City of Lake Angelus, claim lacks the legal capacity to sue? How is that 19 19 which amazingly is almost on all fours with this case. I 20 possible? They're interested parties. Absolutely they 20 have capacity to sue. The pension's involved, the 21 won't describe that case again except to say that that 21 was a case where the Attorney General made the argument 22 pension related to the parties. I don't see any problems 22 that there was no injury and there was no need for 23 23 there. declaratory judgment because a request to a tribunal had 24 And then we have (8), which is always a

<sup>25</sup>13-53846-swr Doc 519-6 Filed 08/19/13

Entered 108/19/13/23:55:20al heave 1100 of 44he

court correctly ruled that the -- there is an actual such action by the Governor is without authority and in violation of Article IX, § 24. And what happened controversy because the parties need the court to tell them what their rights and obligations are so they know yesterday was a violation of the Constitution. 3 what to do in the future; whether this tribunal could 4 Now, my declaratory judgment order declares overrule a local ordinance which prohibited sea planes on these statements. It also has a paragraph at the end 5 Lake Angelus, even though they hadn't been asked and they that says: 6 6 hadn't ruled. So that part is exactly what we have. Now 7 In order to rectify his unauthorized and unconstitutional we have the bankruptcy has been filed. 8 actions described above, the 9 I would like to offer a couple exhibits, which 9 Governor must: One, direct the 10 are the July 16th letter from Emergency Manager Orr 10 11 requesting authorization to file for Chapter 9, which 11 Emergency Manager to immediately amazingly this happened on Tuesday, and none of our --12 withdraw the Chapter 9 petition 12 none of our crack reporters knew about this. Nobody knew filed on July 18th. And, two, 13 13 about this until yesterday. This was a secret letter. not authorize any further Chapter 14 14 9 filing which threatens to 15 And the July 18th letter from yesterday of the 15 Governor authorizing Emergency Manager Orr to file for 16 diminish or impair accrued pension benefits. Chapter 9. And I think if you look at these two letters, 17 17 it is crystal clear what the judge has already concluded Now, this is just a declaratory judgment. So 18 18 19 in the prior case; that not only does the bankruptcy 19 it is my hope that if the Court is willing to enter this, that the Governor will obey his oath of office and follow 20 threaten to impair but that that is the goal and the 20 what the Constitution requires. And so -- and if he does intent of the emergency manager is to impair accrued 21 21 22 pension benefits in bankruptcy. 22 not, then we may be back here on -- with another I'll give these to opposing counsel. These are iteration of this that requires some type of injunctive 23 relief. 24 -- they're a matter of public record now. I just wrote 24 Exhibit A and Exhibit B on them. 25 At this time we're not seeking injunctive 25 30 28 relief, so I would -- I would withdraw our request for 1 (Approaching the bench.) preliminary injunction without prejudice. And I'd also 2 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. MR. CANZANO: As to the merits, I think again ask, if this order is entered, that the temporary 3 it is very clear this isn't a case where you need case restraining order entered yesterday be vacated or expired, and all we want is a declaratory judgment right 5 law. You just read the Constitution. It says accrued pension benefits shall not be diminished or impaired. 6 now. 7 The Constitution says that. The Emergency Manager law 7 THE COURT: And the reason to vacate or expire says the Governor can authorize the Emergency Manager to 8 the temporary restraining order? file for Chapter 9. And it doesn't prohibit that -- it 9 MR. CANZANO: Because now we have the default doesn't require that pension benefits be protected when judgment and the TRO. I don't remember what the court 10 10 11 he files for Chapter 9. And it is, therefore, 11 rule says, but it cannot only exist for a short period of time on its own, and this is the tact that we would like 12 unconstitutional to that extent. 12 to take because we would like to tell the Governor, "This 13 THE COURT: Is there any objection to the Court 13 is what you're supposed to do." And then if he doesn't receiving Exhibit A and B? 14 14 MR. DEVLIN: No objection, your Honor. do that, then we'll then -- we'll reassess our options. 15 15 THE COURT: A and B are received. Thank you. 16 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 16 (At 12:04 p.m., Exhibit A and 17 MR. CANZANO: May I present my draft order? 17 Exhibit B is received.) 18 THE COURT: Yes. Have you presented it to the 18 19 MR. CANZANO: So the emergency manager law is 19 other side? unconstitutional to the extent that it allows the 20 MR. CANZANO: I have not. 20 THE COURT: Thank you. 21 Governor to authorize a Chapter 9 filing which threatens 21 22 to diminish or impair pension benefits. And the Governor 22 MR. QUASARANO: We've looked at this, 23 is prohibited by Article IX, § 24 from authorizing an 23 your Honor. emergency manager to proceed under Chapter 9 in a manner MR. CANZANO: Just as to the matter of the

2513V53846a5Wd to Doeir519u61 pepiledb08/19/13

anyone is arguing -- I don't think the Attorney General is arguing that our case is stayed by the bankruptcy court because we're not suing the Emergency Manager. 3 We're only suing the Governor and the Treasurer and the State of Michigan, and they're not -- they're not in the bankruptcy court. They're not the debtor, so that's an 6 argument that has been raised. But, just for clarity, I wanted to point that out. That's all I have.

THE COURT: Thank you.

10 Response?

9

11

12

1.3

14

17

18

19

20

21

2

3

4

6

7

8

9

1.0 11

12

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

MR. DEVLIN: Thank you, your Honor. Brian Devlin again on behalf of the Defendants. I won't repeat the discussion we had on the Flowers case. Much of that applies. The relief sought in each of these cases is the same position of the State, is that the bankruptcy court 16 jurisdiction has a great effect on this, and that the reliefs that might be desired by the Plaintiffs are available through that court. Furthermore, we'd cite the Straus case as well in this reply.

I would like to call the Court's attention to just one other thing: There was reference made to the 22 Governor's obligation to uphold the terms of the United 23 States -- of the State Constitution but that also applies 24 to the United States Constitution, and bankruptcy court is certainly someone he may have to answer to as well.

So that should not be lost sight of.

Finally, I wanted to point out that we do have a motion for summary disposition pending in this case as well. And I would rely on the arguments in the brief. And the ones I've just restated as well to ask that that relief be granted. Thank you.

THE COURT: Are you asking that that be heard now, or would you like me to make a ruling on that now? MR. DEVLIN: I think you could probably make a ruling on it without further argument.

THE COURT: I think so too.

MR. DEVLIN: All right.

THE COURT: Okay. 13

MR. DEVLIN: Thank you. 14

THE COURT: Anything further?

MR. CANZANO: Nothing further, your Honor. 16

17 THE COURT: All right.

As to the motion for summary disposition in regard to Defendants' motion is denied. I'm going to incorporate the transcript, the arguments of the Flowers matter into this file. I think that in order to have a complete argument, we're going to consolidate the arguments and the files for the purpose of today because

they are really united. They are part and parcel of the 24

25**13**55884664546154075. VD 068151916hav Filed no 18/19/13

transcript without looking at both.

7

8

9 10

23

24 25

12

15

17

18

So I'm going to direct the court reporter to 2 treat today as one transcript despite there being two docket numbers, and I didn't even call both of them, but we just sort of started, but we're really dealing with Dockets 13-734-CZ and 13-729-CZ.

So the motion for summary disposition in regard to 13-734-CZ, and that's Defendants' motion for summary disposition is denied based on the same rationale the Court had and reasoning in the prior case.

In regard to the request for declaratory 11 judgment, I think it is imperative that the Court sign 12 this. It's absolutely needed. And the Governor, I have 13 14 to believe, took his oath in all sincerity to uphold the 15 United States Constitution and the State of Michigan Constitution. I hope he rereads certain sections and 16 reconsiders his actions. 17

I am finding the actions that have been taken 18 in regard to filing this action in the bankruptcy court 19 as overreaching and unconstitutional as it applies to 20 21 what the Detroit Emergency Manager Kevyn Orr has done in conjunction with the Governor. 22

So I find it absolutely necessary to sign this order of declaratory judgment. I am also going to order, in addition to what you have crafted here, that a copy of

this order be forwarded to President Obama. I know that 1

he's watching this, and he's bailed out Detroit. If this 2

is going to ultimately proceed to bankruptcy without

anyone paying attention to Michigan's Constitution and to 4

what the legislature drafted and to what the Governor 5

himself signed into law, then there will ultimately be a

7 request that Obama will have to look at the pension, so

he might as well follow this. He said in the news that 8

he's following this. He might as well see what we've all 9

done here. It's that important to the State of Michigan 10

11 and to the thousands of people who will be affected, and

ultimately all of the taxpayers of the state of Michigan

are going to be affected because we will all have to pick

13

up the tab if this is not honored as it should be. 14

Additionally, I am asked that the temporary restraining order be quashed and nullified, so that is 16 now withdrawn, and it expires today at 12:15. And the order of declaratory judgment is being signed as that 19 expires.

Is there anything else for the record? 20 MR. WERTHEIMER: Not for the Plaintiffs in 21 22 Flowers, your Honor.

MR. QUASARANO: I'm obliged, your Honor, to 23 move for a stay of enforcement of the order of

Entered 08/19/13 23:55:20 Page 12 of 14

```
THE COURT: You are obliged. I am obliged as
 2
    well to deny.
             MR, QUASARANO: I'll have an order ready.
    Thank you, Judge.
             THE COURT: I look forward to signing all of
    those orders today. I will be in until 5 or so. And I
    haven't looked at Monday's docket. Have we taken care of
    all of Monday or not?
             MR. WERTHEIMER: I think, as to the Plaintiffs
9
    in Flowers, you have because our motion was for
10
    preliminary injunction, which you have granted and will
11
    be providing us with that order, and their motion was for
12
    summary disposition, which you've denied. I believe that
14
    was all that was up in Flowers. So that the Flowers case
    continues, but there is nothing up for Monday in Flowers.
15
             MR. QUASARANO: Defendants concur in Flowers.
16
17
             THE COURT: Okay. My law clerk is making
    copies, multiple copies, of the order I've just signed.
18
             I am here on a moment's notice as you all have
19
20
    become accustomed to if you need me.
21
             MR. WERTHEIMER: Thank you, your Honor.
             THE COURT: That's all for the record.
22
             MR. CANZANO: Thank you, your Honor.
23
    Appreciate the Court's ability and willingness to help us
24
25
    out on this urgent time.
                                                    36
             THE COURT: Thank you.
1
                 (At 12:16 p.m., the matter is
 2
                 concluded.)
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
```

1	STATE OF MICHIGAN)
2	) SS. COUNTY OF INGHAM)
3	
4	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
5	
6	I, Melinda I. Dexter, Certified Shorthand
7	Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing
8	37 pages comprise an accurate, true, and complete
9	transcript of the proceedings and testimony taken in the
10	case of Gracie Webster, et al. versus Richard Snyder, et
11	al., Case Nos. 13-734-CZ and 13-729-CZ, on Friday,
12	July 19, 2013.
13	I further certify that this transcript of the
14	record of the proceedings and testimony truly and
15	correctly reflects the exhibits, if any, offered by the
16	respective parties. WITNESS my hand this the <u>nineteenth</u>
17	day of <u>July</u> , 2013.
18	
19	
20	
21	March Cat
22	Melinda I. Dexter, RMR, RPR, CSR-4629
23	Official Court Reporter 313 West Kalamazoo
24	Post Office Box 40771 Lansing Michigan 48901-7971