A CIRCUIT JUDGE CONTEMPLATES RETIREMENT
By the Honorable Paul J. Clulo, Circuit Court Judge
42nd Circuit Court, Midland County, Michigan

I recently announced that I would be stepping down as Circuit Judge for Midland County after 23 years on the bench and another 20 as a practicing lawyer with an emphasis on family law. I suppose that’s what prompted Ken Randall to ask me to address the members of RAM, and I was happy to oblige. My thoughts in contemplating the almost half century since I entered law school center on change.

And that’s what I’d like to do here; to reflect with important members of the domestic law family some of my observations on the incredible changes that have taken place in our business over that time.

- Technology

This one’s easy. I started my law career with typewriters and carbon paper, law books with lousy indices, and docket control that consisted of a case call once a quarter on the record with the judge who set cases for the quarter and walked away. The fact that I’m now in front of a computer using Word to write this article, the same computer I use to do any and all legal research and can copy anything I want from this desktop to a printer sitting next to me is quite amazing to me. My docket is controlled through the same computer that generates reports to SCAO on “how I’m doing” and my daily schedule is on-line for counsel and parties to see. I can also bring up a file docket of every case in my court including every pleading.

Well, that is obviously a major change in how we do things from my point of view. I understand that this is simply the way it is to a lot of your younger readers. I’ll leave it there. People who have to ask, “what’s carbon paper” won’t get it anyhow!

(Continued on page 2...)

Senator Carl Levin shares his thoughts on substance abuse treatment — Page 6

IMPORTANT DATES—MARK YOUR CALENDARS!

RAM Board Meetings
(At State Bar of Michigan Building in Lansing unless otherwise noted)

July 19, 2007, 10 am
September 27, 2007 (at State Bar Meeting in GR)
November 8, 2007, 10 am
December 13, 2007
Christmas Party, time to be determined

Annual State Bar of Michigan Fall Meeting:
September 26-28, 2007
DeVos Place/Amway Grand, Grand Rapids

Inside this issue:

- President's Corner
- Addiction Treatment
- Attorney Billing
- Year in Review
- Legal Update
- Conference Recap
- Contacts
• Specialization

I’ve practiced and sat on the general jurisdiction trial court in a fairly small community. I am probably the last in a dying breed of general practitioners who tried to be all things to all people. That’s getting to be harder and harder. While I think it gave me the ideal background to sit on the Circuit bench, even in my small town, specialization is now the rule and not the exception. That seems rather sad to me, but let’s face it; lawyers today cannot possibly meet the required standard of care and expect to have an office open to all comers. Additionally, the proliferation throughout the state of family practitioners that concentrate their practice on one of the most difficult areas of the law can only be seen as a good thing. But the change in my lifetime is rather dramatic.

• Federalization of Child Support Enforcement

Here’s one we can all identify with. Little did I know or recognize in 1975 that a revolution was taking place. I had been practicing law for ten years when Congress amended the Social Security Act to create the IV-D structure that we still live with, albeit with many changes. But that Act set up the beginning of the cooperative reimbursement contract that became the basis for fundamental change in dealing with families and the ever-changing family structures that we, as a court, were faced with. It also reminds us all of the tie bar and tension between federal money and the required federal regulations.

Let me go back. I have always felt that we in Michigan are extremely lucky to have had in place for 90 years the Friend of the Court system. There was no other state that addressed these important family issues in such an integrated way as Michigan . . . ."

“[W]e in Michigan are extremely lucky to have had in place for 90 years the Friend of the Court system. There was no other state that addressed these important family issues in such an integrated way as Michigan . . . .”

Of course, that was not the end. Since I took the bench in 1985, here is a partial list of the specific requirements we have had to deal with;

(Continued on page 3)
• Adding non-welfare parents to the mix
• Expedited process
• Establishing child support guidelines
• Establishing tax-offset procedures
• Emphasizing interstate enforcement
• Requiring periodic review of orders (we were the only state that had that on the statute books before it was required)
• Immediate income withholding
• Establishing visitation and custody demonstration projects (we were the only state to have visitation enforcement as a part of our child support enforcement statute prior to the feds looking at this)
• Implementing the child support guidelines as a rebuttable presumption
• Establishing a guideline review process (something our Supreme Court seems to want to finesse. Can you imagine the legislature getting in to this act?)
• And who can forget the CSES debacle as it forced our effective and, unfortunately, local system to adjust to a statewide collection system with Wal-Mart and GM winning the argument on the SDSU component.

Indeed, that’s a partial list of the revolutionary change in the court’s responsibilities to the families of our communities. And let’s not forget the establishment in our state of the Family Division of the Circuit Court.

I was up to my ears throughout this process with trips to Lansing. I sat on the first task force set up to establish our tax offset procedures. I was also on the Friend of the Court Advisory Committee that was handed the responsibility of establishing Michigan’s Child Support Guidelines in 1987. I chaired the first subcommittee that handled the initial review of the guidelines. I also sat on the Supreme Court task force that made recommendations that allowed the sparse and confusing Family Court Legislation to be implemented. All in all, if you’re unhappy in your work these days in the family court, you have me to thank!

(Continued on Page 4 . . . )
I must share with you, however, a delightful task I carried out for about 5 years. I had the opportunity early on in the process to work with the National Center For State Courts, the organization that had a Federal contract to educate the national judiciary on child support enforcement – Federal style. What was a pleasure for me was to see how favorably Michigan compared in our Friend of the Court system approach to that of other states who were new to the game and didn’t have a clue how to begin. For many years, Michigan collected and disbursed more child support in real dollars; forget population, than any other state in the union. As I stated above, we paid the price for our county-centered system when we were forced into the statewide model. But that being said, everyone involved has stepped to the plate and continued the reputation for excellence that we have always enjoyed.

All of this is in no small thanks to the members of RAM who are an integral part of the process, and without whom we judges simply couldn’t properly do our jobs.

Thanks to you all and keep up the good work. Maybe I’ll run into you as I take on one of the my new duties in retirement - “Have robe, will travel.”

The Honorable Paul J. Clulo has served as Circuit Court Judge for the 42nd Circuit (Midland County) since 1985, and served as Chief Circuit Court Judge from 1988 until 1998. Judge Clulo is renowned for his family law expertise.

In 1990, he was named the National “Judge of the Year” by the National Child Support Enforcement Association. In 1988, Judge Clulo was chairman of a Michigan child support guidelines committee. He has served actively as a faculty member for the Michigan Judicial Institute, the Michigan Institute for Continuing Legal Education, the Institute for Court Management (Denver, CO), the National Center for State Courts (Williamsburg, VA), and the National Judicial College (University of Nevada—Reno). He is an active member of the Michigan Judges Association, and served as president in 1999. Judge Clulo has served on the State Court Administrative Office’s Family Court Division Implementation Task Force, as chairman of the Michigan Judges Association Domestic Relations Committee, and as an attorney-member of the Friend of the Court Advisory Committee which he chaired from 1989 to 1991.

In addition to his twenty-two years of service as Circuit Court Judge in Midland County, Judge Clulo was in private practice for eighteen years. He holds degrees from both the University of Notre Dame and Marquette University, and is admitted to practice law in both Wisconsin and Michigan.

The Hon. Paul J. Clulo will retire from public service when he leaves the Midland County bench in August, 2007.
I am reminded about a woman that indicated that she wanted to be buried with a fork. The reason for this request was; she had attended many church pot lucks over the years. When folks collected the plates, they would always tell her to save her fork, because dessert was next. In her death, she was going to be prepared with her fork. She knew the best was yet to come! So it is with the vision for RAM.

With the awareness of the constraints of time and demands of the job that all of us face, it is even more important to make efficiency a top priority. It is hoped that we can encourage and facilitate participation by referees from throughout the State in the RAM Board meetings. This can be done by teleconference. The web site will be an instrument to give those who were not able to attend the conference a little sample of what they missed. This may be accomplished by audio streaming. I have learned that the State Bar may be able to help with this.

The letter will be sent to Dan Wright at SCAO regarding the support of RAM for the recommendations after review of the child support formula.

There is a movement to create an updated referee manual. The goal of the manual is to have up to date case law on any given topic that may come up before the court available at a glance to the owner of the manual.

We are looking forward to another great conference in Petoskey next year. I understand that we already have one speaker lined up.

After writing about the year in review, I see that my year personally and professionally has taken many twists and turns. You never can really predict what will happen. RAM is growing and gaining in recognition. It is hoped that we can continue to invite the referees who have not yet participated to contribute their talents. We welcome participation by those from a wide variety of jurisdictions. The diversity creates new variations on sometimes old themes. I look forward to the possibilities that have not yet presented them selves, and achieving the goals that have been set.

Submitted by:
Kathleen M. Oemke
June 15, 2007
An Addiction Treatment that Works

By Senator Carl Levin
Senior United States Senator from Michigan

[Senator Levin graciously accepted our invitation to write an article for this month’s Quarterly—we appreciate his taking time from his very busy schedule to write about this important issue in the area of substance abuse treatment. - Ed.]

Heroin abuse plagues many of our communities, bringing drug-related crime and violence and tearing families apart. Roughly one million people in the United States are addicted to heroin, and more than three million individuals over the age of 12 have used heroin at least once according to the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

There are no easy or quick solutions to this epidemic, but effective treatment programs can and must play an integral role as we fight back. In recent years, a new anti-addiction medicine called buprenorphine has revolutionized the way we treat heroin addiction, and Congress recently acted to make it more widely available.

One of the difficulties in the fight against drug abuse has been a lack of effective treatments. This was especially true for recovering heroin users, who for many years depended on methadone, itself addictive, that was dispensed only in centralized clinics often located far from those seeking treatment.

For families with a loved one in treatment for heroin addiction, the stigma of having to travel to a public methadone clinic, usually far from their home, adds yet another obstacle to their recovery.

However, in the early 1990s I learned of buprenorphine, widely known as ‘bup,’ which drastically improves the way we treat heroin addiction. Bup functions as a drug ‘blocker,’ suppressing the craving for heroin and other opiate drugs, including prescription painkillers. To learn more, I visited drug treatment centers and research labs and worked to foster a national dialogue on addiction and treatment.

In 2000, the bipartisan Drug Addiction Treatment Act (DATA), which I sponsored with my Republican colleague, Senator Orrin Hatch of Utah, authorized physicians to prescribe and dispense bup in their private offices pending approval by the Food and Drug Administration, which came in 2002. DATA permitted physicians to dispense bup if they had received the specialized training required under DATA, were able to refer patients to counseling and other related services, and agreed to treat no more than 30 patients at a time.

Last year, I hosted a symposium with Senator Hatch, which brought together physicians, health policy experts, Health and Human Services officials and patients to review the results of the first three years of office-based bup treatment. Overwhelmingly, experts agreed that bup has successfully helped many people rehabilitate their lives. A survey required by DATA and completed by the Department of Health and Human Services found that bup has been effective and well-received among patients, shown minimal adverse effects and increased the availability of medication-assisted treatment programs.

Some of the most dramatic portions of the symposium came during the testimony from patients whose lives have turned around since being introduced to bup. One of these patients was a college student in Boston who spent more than three years in the grips of heroin addiction. During that time, she underwent methadone detox ten times—ten!—before bup helped her to feel “normal for the first time in three and a half years.” She returned to school a short time later, made the dean’s list and graduated this spring.

(Continued on Page 7 . . . )
An Addiction Treatment that Works, continued from page 6 ...

The Senate symposium also highlighted a troublesome limitation on the use of bup. Too many physicians have been forced to deny treatment to potential patients because they are already at the 30-patient limit. This was a tragic and arbitrary limitation for thousands of Americans who could benefit from bup, so last December Congress passed an amendment I authored with Senator Hatch to increase the limit to 100 patients per physician and the president signed it into law.

With this important change, which has more than tripled the number of patients with access to bup in their physician’s office, we are closer to fully realizing the lifesaving, family-saving and community-saving potential of bup.

For families in our state dealing with the struggle of a loved one with a heroin addiction there are over 240 physicians and 20 treatment programs in Michigan offering buprenorphine treatment. More information about buprenorphine can be found on the website of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration Center for Substance Abuse Treatment at http://buprenorphine.samhsa.gov/. The site also offers a locator at http://buprenorphine.samhsa.gov/bwns_locator/index.html with the name, address and telephone number of every doctor and program in Michigan offering buprenorphine treatment.

Carl Levin was born in 1934 in Detroit, where he graduated from Central High School. In 1956, he graduated with honors from Swarthmore College and graduated from Harvard University Law School in 1959. He practiced and taught law in Michigan until 1964 when he was appointed an assistant attorney general of Michigan and the first general counsel for the Michigan Civil Rights Commission. He then helped establish the Detroit Public Defender's Office and led the Appellate Division of that office, which has become the State Appellate Defender's Office.

He won election to the Detroit City Council in 1969, becoming its president in 1973 by winning the most votes citywide. In 1978, he won an upset victory over the number two Republican in the U.S. Senate. He was reelected in 1984, 1990, 1996 and 2002. He is currently the senior United States Senator from Michigan, and the Chairman of the U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee.

RAM WEBSITE REACHES 10,000 HITS!

RAM launched its web site on St Patrick’s Day 2005, and installed a “counter” on April 1, 2005. The counter logs the number of hits, or visits, the web site receives. The site has averaged 85 visits per week since its creation.

That’s a lot of clicks!
New Attorney Billing Method
Bad For Families?

Contributed by Ken Randall

On May 3, 2007, the Michigan chapter of the American Academy of Matrimonial Lawyers held an advanced-level family law seminar in Birmingham, Michigan. This prestigious group consists of some of the more highly respected and sought-after family law attorneys in all of Michigan, a veritable Who’s-Who in domestic relations law.

One of the topics presented was “Big Bucks, Big Risks: The Role of Results-Oriented Fees in the Practice of Matrimonial Law.” Two attorneys presented the half-hour session, Robert Z. Feldstein from Troy, and John F. Schaefer who has offices in both Birmingham and Grosse Pointe (and who has been listed with “The Best Lawyers in America” according to the firm’s web site http://www.lflfs.com).

The crux of the discussion focused on a new vogue in billing where family law attorneys now charge “value added fees” in addition to a deposit of money to get a lawyer to take a case. The value added fees are collected at the conclusion of a case if certain goals are achieved, such as physical custody or a favorable property settlement. When charging this way, a good family law attorney can make far more money than he or she would with hourly billing. The statement was made that “Hourly fees are unfair to clients,” which may be true if a client loses a case. Yet, if an attorney wins a high-dollar case, many hundreds of thousands of dollars can be earned. (The lowest number given was $50,000 and the highest was $500,000 – though one of the presenters indicated he would never charge more than 10% of the overall property settlement).

Admittedly, my reaction to hearing this new billing method was a little schizoid. Part of me wanted to jump up and shout “Right on!” and “That’s the way it’s done!” because part of me likes the idea that lawyers can earn lots of money to reward the hard work and skills that can take an entire career to cultivate. Yet part of me wanted to gasp and say “No way!” because such billing will only create acrimony and combat litigation, which rarely benefits children and families. I’ve worked with social workers for so many years that it is now a knee jerk reaction for me to want to help families, to try to get them to mediate not litigate.

The presenters referenced the case of Jordan v Westerman, 62 Mich 170 (1886), which articulated the long-standing public policy in Michigan against contingent fees in domestic relations cases. The Court was concerned that a contingency contract with a lawyer would prevent reconciliation of the parties. Model Rule MRPC 1.5(d) was later drafted to prohibit the imposition of contingent fees in domestic relations cases. Contingent fees are defined as an agreement for an attorney to represent a client for a certain percentage of an amount recovered.

Continued on page 9...
Though nearly identical to contingent fees, value added fees are distinguishable in that they are based on quantum meruit and are charged as an additional fee agreed upon by the attorney and client at the conclusion of a case based on the outcome and the skill required. The concept was affirmed in Olson v Olson, 256 Mich App 619, 637 (2003). (In that case the trial court ordered the defendant husband to pay the wife’s attorney fees and costs totaling approximately $1,000,000.)

Are result-oriented fees bad for families? The question is complicated and brings many answers. So long as there is no prohibition against such fees, it is ultimately up to the market to decide whether attorneys should charge them. If clients are willing to pay, attorneys will certainly accept their money.

Ken Randall

May 8, 2007
THE “RAM” YEAR IN REVIEW—One Person’s Perspective

Submitted by Kathy Oemke, RAM President

As I look back on my first year and reflect on the goals that were set as president, I am awed by the dedication of those in our line of work. Each and every referee with whom I have spoken or been acquainted with has shown dedication to the children of this State.

The goals for RAM would include that: this organization of these dedicated people to be recognized by those who have influence in our field of practice; second, would be for RAM to be of value to the individual members in their everyday work.

I am grateful for the previous leadership and mentorship of Ken Randall. He has left me a great act to follow. He has also continued his dedication by recruiting a variety of excellent authors for the Referee Quarterly. He has been the unofficial photojournalist for RAM. He has promoted an image of RAM to be a valuable service organization to our membership.

RAM has made many great strides to increase its membership and participation. It is hoped that these will continue to expand. At our conference, we had sixty referees from eighteen counties. The web site has been a great common place where referees can find information and information can be provided. We have had a guest speaker at just about all of our board meetings. From SCAO, Dan Wright from Family Services and Jennifer Warner from Trial Court Services have bee among the regular attendees of our Board meetings. This allows our membership to be updated about services and have input in policy. Ken Randall and Ron Foon participated, at Dan Wright’s request, in evaluating changes in the child support formula. Traci Rink has represented RAM in the Family Law Section with style. She has been a great liaison with this diverse group.

This year we had two life time memberships honored: Jon Ferrier and Karen Liwienski. Helen Hartford has done a great job of organizing and staging the conference in Petoskey. In addition to being in a great location and with perfect weather, the featured speakers provided great information. The fellowship with other referees is always a highlight for me. It was great to see returning referees as well as new faces. Karen Transit did an outstanding job on the awards. The award winners were truly deserving of the honors. They are: Dan Loomis, Arthur Spears, Linda Weiss, and Ken Randall. Certificates were given to those referees achieving five, ten, fifteen and twenty years of service as referees. It is hoped that all participants gained some boost in knowledge, understanding, or support through their presence at the conference. If not, please volunteer your ideas or time for next years conference. I am sure it will be rewarding. And now, we look to what is yet to come for the future of RAM.

Submitted by: Kathleen M. Oemke, June 15, 2007

1 Everyone liked the location so much that the membership present voted to return for a third year.

2 I am somewhat prejudiced by the fact that the committee was successful in keeping secret the award with which I was presented.
CASE LAW, STATUTE, AND COURT RULE UPDATE

Contributed by Ed Messing

The first published case addressing the constitutionality of the 2004 Grandparent Time statute resulted in a holding that the statute was deemed constitutional as applied in Keenan v Dawson__Mich App__(#265725 6/5/07). The maternal grandparents had been denied contact with their daughter’s child after her very suspicious death because they believed the Defendant had murdered their daughter. The court had conducted a two day evidentiary hearing including testimony of a psychologist and found by a preponderance of evidence that substantial harm to two year old child would result if grand parenting time was not granted, based upon the emotional harm caused by the untimely death of a child’s mother and inability of the child to remember his mother. The maternal grandparents and the child’s mother had a strained relationship prior to her death because of her marriage to the Defendant, although testimony was presented that the grandparent’s relationship with their daughter had improved just prior to her death.

The Court of Appeal determined in Butler v Michigan State Disbursement Unit __Mich App__(#271818 4/19/07) that a recipient of support was not entitled to compensation for interest retained by MSDK from payer’s support payments as the annual interest was less than the cost to mail payment to plaintiff, and her net loss was $0, and therefore there was no “taking” of property.

Imputation of income in determining support was again addressed by the court in Stallworth v Stallworth __Mich App__(#266202 4/17/07). The support payer’s criminal conviction that causes loss of a current job, or inability to obtain new employment, is not a voluntary reduction income justifying imputation of income; the court opined that, in fact, the payer was arguably attempting to augment his income through his criminal activity. However, the court can determine that the actual income of a self employed individual is a specific amount in excess of the reported income based on evidence such as large amounts of cash in the home, the party’s lifestyle, and expenditures in excess of reported income. Of course, this may be modified by adoption of the new child support formula later this year.

The court again addressed the necessity to strictly comply with MCL 600.5072 prior to ordering arbitration in Johnson v Johnson __Mich App__(#261919 6/7/07). The case involved a dispute between the parties over 2 alleged separation dates 18 years apart, and a Plaintiff with 2 families. The case was further complicated by the fact that it was heard by 3 different trial judges, and resulted in a separate opinion by each of the three appellate justices. Plaintiff’s defaults based upon his failure to cooperate with arbitration was reversed because the court did not obtain a written or oral acknowledgment of the pre-arbitration disclosures required under MCL 600.5072.

In Koy v Koy __Mich App__ (2007) (#265587 3/3/07) the Court properly denied Defendant’s motion to set aside the Default divorce judgment, entered for failure to comply with numerous court orders and comply with discovery, failure to appear at a settlement conference and hearing and also failed to pay court ordered attorney fees and sanctions. However, the court had improperly failed to make factual findings to support the property division after the default, and spousal support which was ordered must be modifiable.

Continued on page 12...
Although there were no published Juvenile cases, there were a number of unpublished cases that, while non binding, should cause referees to proceed with caution. The court abused its discretion when refusing to consider appointment of counsel for an imprisoned respondent facing involuntary termination of parental rights under MCL 710.51(6), In re Harris Unpub Ct App # 273430 3/29/07 citing In re Sanchez, 422 Mich 758 (1985).

Because the Court had already found no there was no physical abuse, it could not assume jurisdiction based on a substantial risk of harm to the child’s mental health based on the child’s statement that she did not feel safe with respondent and didn’t know when she would get beat again, and Respondent’s statement that counseling would help the situation, In re Anderson Unpub Ct App #272397 3/15/07.

The Court should not have dismissed the petition for temporary custody of Respondent’s children and termination of his parental right even though the children were safe with their mother. The allegations that Respondent was charged with 4 counts of 1st degree CSC with an unrelated child, failure to exercise supervised visits for 6 months and provide support, and the abuse of the mother and children were, if true, sufficient to bring the children under the court’s jurisdiction, In re Helgemo Unpub Ct App#271047 4/17/07. (compare with 2006 PA 630 amending MCL 722.637)

The Court of Appeals reversed termination of parental rights as although Respondent’s 3 month old baby died from pneumonia (with possible malnutrition) and she failed to seek timely medical care, she had previously provided adequate food, shelter, and medical care for the older children and should have been given a treatment plan for them. In re Lamar Unpub Ct App#273314 5/10/07.

• STATUTES

The legislature has been primarily occupied for the first six months with the budget, see 2007 PA 3, 2007 PA 17, and replacing the Single Business Tax. Domestic Relations Referees will be visited by reluctant named Plaintiffs thanks to 2007 PA 9 which again provides that assistance benefits shall be terminated if the recipient fails to comply with establishment of support and paternity determinations, unless good has been established to exempt the recipient from proceeding.

• COURT RULES

MCR 3.963, Court ordered custody: At the time it issues the order or as provided in MCR 3.965(D), the court shall make a judicial determination that reasonable efforts to prevent removal of the child have been made or are not required.

MCR 3.965 (D)(1) Preliminary Hearing When the court has placed a child with someone other than the custodial parent, guardian, or legal custodian, the court must determine whether reasonable efforts to prevent the removal of the child have been made or that reasonable efforts to prevent removal are not required. … (b)(3)(ii) aiding or abetting, or attempting, conspiring, or soliciting to commit such a murder or such a voluntary manslaughter, or … . 

Continued on page 13...
MCR 3.976 Permanency Planning Hearings (B)(1)(a) There has been a judicial determination that the child's parent has subjected the child to aggravated circumstances as listed in sections 18(1) and (2) of the Child Protection Law, 1975 PA 238, MCL 722.638.
(b)(iii) aiding or abetting, attempting, conspiring, or soliciting to commit such a murder or such a voluntary manslaughter; or …

MCR 3.921 Persons Entitled to Notice (1)(g) The foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, and relative caregivers of a child in foster care under the responsibility of the state, and (h) any other person the court may direct to be notified.
(2) (k) the foster parents, pre-adoptive parents, and relative caregivers of a child in foster care under the responsibility of the state, and (l) any other person the court may direct to be notified.

Rule 3.904. Use of Interactive Video Technology.
(A) Facilities. Courts may use two-way interactive video technology to conduct the proceedings outlined in subrule (B).
(B) Hearings.
(1) Delinquency Proceedings. Two-way interactive video technology may be used to conduct hearings in which the court does not order a more restrictive placement or more restrictive treatment, and may be used to conduct preliminary hearings under MCR 3.935(A)(1), post-dispositional progress reviews, and dispositional hearings.
(2) Child Protective Proceedings. Two-way interactive video technology may be used to conduct preliminary hearings or review hearings.
(C) Mechanics of Use. The use of two-way interactive video technology must be conducted in accordance with any requirements and guidelines established by the State Court Administrative Office. All proceedings at which such technology is used must be recorded verbatim by the court.

Call for Articles!

We need you! If you have news, events, legal updates, or just great “war stories” to share with your fellow RAM members, please send them to us for publication in the next Quarterly! Material can be sent to Ken Randall at kdrandall@aol.com, or to Linda Weiss at lweiss@co.midland.mi.us.
The Perry Hotel has been such a wonderful host for RAM’s conferences in 2006 and 2007 that we are returning for a third year in 2008! If you haven’t joined us there yet, please make plans now to enjoy Petoskey and the Perry with us next May!
Checking in and getting settled...

“Whaddya mean there’s no AARP discount here??”

Nancy Thane and Erin Magley, keeping us all organized!

Getting signed up and checked in

“Golf, Euchre, or Trivial Pursuit?”

Seeing old friends and meeting new ones...

Nancy telling Art where he can go (the meeting room, that is!)
Some working...

Attorney Referee Ed Messing

Martha Burkett, SBM Lawyers and Judges Assistance Program

Sgt. Tony Nettles, Lansing Police Department

Dr. Carol Holden Center for Forensic Psychiatry

Retired Referee Jon Ferrier
And Some Playing....
And a Little More Fun . . .
Relaxing in Beautiful Petoskey...
Recognizing Our Colleagues and Friends . . .

Kathy Oemke receives accolades, presented by Paul Jacokes.

Dan Loomis

Kathy Oemke

Jon Ferrier receives his RAM shirt from Kathy.

Ken Randall receives his award.

Dan Wright receives his plaque from Paul.

Linda Weiss

Art Spears receiving his award from Paul Jacokes

Art Spears

20
The Phil Ingraham Memorial Golf Scramble
(a/k/a “A Chance to Beat Art Spears in a Round of Golf”)

On your mark....get set....

Art and Mark in the secret RAMmobile

Harbor Pointe Golf Club

A beautiful day on the links...

Time for that mid-game sugar and caffeine!

“No, honest, it really WAS a hole-in-one!!
It was unbelievable!!”

Art’s Team conquers all for the golf championship title!
## Referees’ Association of Michigan — Contacts

### Officers—2006-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Circuit/County</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Kathleen M. Oemke</td>
<td>44th Judicial Circuit</td>
<td>Livingston County, P.O. Box 707, Howell, MI 48844, (517) 540-7756, <a href="mailto:KOemke@co.livingston.mi.us">KOemke@co.livingston.mi.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Arthur Spears</td>
<td>6th Judicial Circuit Court</td>
<td>Oakland County, P.O. Box 436012, Pontiac, MI 48343-6012, (248) 858-0437 Phone, (248) 858-2050 Facsimile, <a href="mailto:Ars33@yahoo.com">Ars33@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
<td>Erin Magley</td>
<td>20th Circuit Court</td>
<td>Grand Haven, MI 49417, (616) 846-8270 Phone, (616) 846-8179 Facsimile, <a href="mailto:magleye@michigan.gov">magleye@michigan.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Paul Jacokes</td>
<td>16th Judicial Circuit</td>
<td>Mount Clemens, MI 48043, (586) 469-5062 Phone, (586) 469-7941 Facsimile, <a href="mailto:pjacokessr@yahoo.com">pjacokessr@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Board Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Circuit/County</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Kenneth D. Randall (Past President)</td>
<td>42nd Judicial Circuit</td>
<td>Midland County, 301 West Main Street, Midland, MI 48640-5183, (989) 832-6803 Phone, (989) 832-6392 Facsimile, <a href="mailto:KDRandall@aol.com">KDRandall@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>Ronald H. Foon</td>
<td>6th Judicial Circuit Court</td>
<td>Referee/Supervisor FOC—Oakland Co., P.O. Box 436012, Pontiac, MI 48343-6012, (248) 858-0269 Phone, (248) 858-2050 Fax, <a href="mailto:foonr@co.oakland.mi.us">foonr@co.oakland.mi.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Secretary</td>
<td>Helen T. Hartford</td>
<td>30th Judicial Circuit Court</td>
<td>Lansing, MI 48901, (517) 483-6280 Phone, (517) 483-6107, <a href="mailto:FC_Hartford@ingham.org">FC_Hartford@ingham.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording Secretary</td>
<td>Nancy L. Thane</td>
<td>Tuscola County Family Court</td>
<td>440 North State Street, Caro, MI 48723, <a href="mailto:Thansen@mi.gov">Thansen@mi.gov</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer (Juvenile)</td>
<td>Karen M. Transit</td>
<td>16th Judicial Circuit Court</td>
<td>Referee (Juvenile) - Macomb County, 380 North Rose Street, Mount Clemens, MI 48043, (586) 469-5684 Phone, (586) 469-6276 Fax, <a href="mailto:ktesq@wideopenwest.com">ktesq@wideopenwest.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording Secretary (Juvenile)</td>
<td>Carolyn J. Jackson</td>
<td>6th Judicial Circuit Court</td>
<td>Referee (FOC) - Oakland County, P.O. Box 436012, Pontiac, MI 48343-6012, (248) 975-9770 Phone, (248) 858-2050 Fax, <a href="mailto:Jackson.ca@co.oakland.mi.us">Jackson.ca@co.oakland.mi.us</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Committees and Liaisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee</th>
<th>Chairperson</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law and Court Rule Committee</td>
<td>Jon T. Ferrier, Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics Committee</td>
<td>Dan Loomis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership Committee</td>
<td>Erin Magley, Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages and Benefits Committee</td>
<td>Erin Magley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Conference Committee</td>
<td>Helen T. Hartford, Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Bar Family Law Section</td>
<td>Barbara Kelly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Committee</td>
<td>Paul Jacokes, Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awards Committee</td>
<td>Karen M. Transit, Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAO Liaison</td>
<td>Dan Wright</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution and By-Laws</td>
<td>Ronald Foon, Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications</td>
<td>Kenneth D. Randall, Co-Chairperson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td>Kenneth D. Randall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The opinions expressed in this publication do not necessarily represent those of the Board of Directors of the Referees’ Association of Michigan.