Greetings, RAM members and those who wish they were. I just returned from the 2008 Michigan Family Support Council Annual Training Conference at Boyne Highlands, a very successful seminar in every way. One of the most consistent themes drawn out by several of our plenary speakers (OCSE Commissioner Margot Bean and OSC IV-D Director Marilyn Stephen) was the concept of empathy toward the litigants who appear before us seeking relief.

Empathy has a few intellectual sounding definitions, but at its core, it is the concept of putting oneself in someone else’s shoes, of being completely understanding of those who appear in our courtrooms. As Steven Covey (the author of The 7 Habits of Highly Effective People) has observed, “seek first to understand, then to be understood.”

(Con’t on page 2)
This concept is, of course, distinguished from sympathy for or sharing the feelings of the litigants, which leads, among other things, down the path toward bias or prejudice. In fact, as we have all discovered, sympathy can also be a factor which causes us a great deal of inner turmoil, when we emotionally invest or identify with one side or the other and the outcomes of the case.

But empathy, in its best sense, is a tool we can employ to assist in our decision making and to help us make more quality decisions. When we understand those who appear before us, we are less likely to be dismissive of the less than perfect presentation, the inartful drafting of pleadings, the angry petitioner or respondent who feels their life is being taken from them, by a large unresponsive system. The manner in which we conduct our hearings and the decisions we finally make are those in which we feel more confident and which bear a closer relationship to the lives of the people.

The folks who appear before us arrive from a variety of backgrounds, ethnicities, income levels, professions and personalities. By utilizing empathy as a guide to the conduct of our hearings we are better equipped to address these variables and by extension to make our courts more responsive to the needs of those most in need of our decisions.

\textit{Contributed by Art Spears}

**RAM MEMBERS SHARING THEIR EXPERTISE**

\textbf{Ed Messing} spoke at the Friend of the Court Association (FOCA) conference in Bay City, August 6, 2008. The topic was legislative updates.

\textbf{Nancy Thane and Ken Randall} co-presented (along with Terry Novakoski) at the Michigan Judicial Institute new FOC employee training conference at the Hall of Justice in Lansing, September 4, 2008. The topics were child support formula and child support enforcement.


* * * * *

(If you are a referee and you have given a presentation since the last \textit{Referees’ Quarterly}, please contact Linda Weiss or Ken Randall so that we may post your information. Thanks!)
RAM BOARD MEETINGS – ALL MEMBERS WELCOME!

Next Board Meeting:

State Bar of Michigan Building
Lansing, MI

Thursday, November 13, 2008
10:00 a.m.

Holiday Luncheon

Redwood Lodge
Flint, MI

Thursday, December 11, 2008
Time TBA

Mark your Calendars now, and join us!
MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 24, 2008

TO: Magistrates and Referees
cc: Chief Judges

FROM: Carl L. Gromek

RE: Magistrate and Referee Financial Reporting

After consulting with representatives from the judicial associations, the State Bar of Michigan, and the Executive Director of the Judicial Tenure Commission, I am left with the inescapable conclusion that because referees and magistrates are subject to the Michigan Code of Judicial Conduct [MCR 9.201(B)(2)], they are also required to file financial reports pursuant to Canons 6C and 5C(4)(c).

Beginning with the 2008 Financial Report (due on or before April 15, 2009), every full-time and part-time magistrate and referee must annually submit a Financial Report form (SCAO 17 - the same form used by the judges) to the State Court Administrative Office with a copy to the chief judge of the court in which the magistrate or referee serves. The Financial Report form has been revised to include magistrates and referees. A copy of the revised form is attached. Chief judges should review the reports for potential conflicts and notify their regional administrator of any problems.

Attachment
FINANCIAL REPORT FOR YEAR

The deadline for submitting this report is the same date required by the Internal Revenue Service for submission of tax returns.

TO: State Court Administrative Office
c/o Regional Administrator

FROM: Name of judge/magistrate/referee
Bar no:

Court number and name:

Address:

City, state, and zip

Telephone no.

PART 1: COMPENSATION FOR SERVICES
(To be completed by judges, magistrates, and referees.)
(Except judicial/court salary and payment for serving on assignments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Name of Payor</th>
<th>Nature of Services</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: $

PART 2: JUDICIAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

A. Received
☐ A detailed report of campaign contributions and expenditures filed with the Secretary of State on

   Date

   lists total contributions of

   $.

B. Disbursed
☐ A detailed report of campaign contributions and expenditures filed with the Secretary of State on

   Date

   lists total expenditures of

   $.

C. Balance After Payment of Expenses

   a. Amount returned to contributors
   $.

   b. Amount donated to the Client Security Fund, State Bar of Michigan
   $.

   Total: $

PART 3: GIFTS OVER $100
(To be completed by judges, magistrates, and referees.)

☐ None

Amount of all gifts having a value exceeding $100.00

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Person/Entity from whom Received</th>
<th>Reason for Gift</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ I am a magistrate/referee, and I provided a copy of my completed report to the chief judge of the court in which I am employed.

Date

SCAO 17 (6/09) FINANCIAL REPORT

(Canon 8C, Michigan Code of Judicial Conduct)
FINANCIAL REPORT INSTRUCTIONS

Canon 6C, Financial Reports, Michigan Code of Judicial Conduct, effective September 1, 1995, provides:
"A judge shall report the date, place and nature of any activity for which the judge received compensation, and the name of the payor and the amount of compensation so received. The judge's report shall be made at least annually and shall be filed as a public document in the office of the State Court Administrator or other office designated by law."

This report should be made at least annually and shall be filed as a public document in the State Court Administrative Office (SCAO). As defined by MCR 9.231(B), the term "judge" includes magistrates and referees. Therefore, this report shall also be completed and filed with SCAO by every full- and part-time magistrate and every referee and a copy of the report provided to the chief judge.

PART 1: COMPENSATION FOR SERVICES  (To be completed by judges, magistrates, and referees.)

INCLUDE:

a. Extra-judicial or quasi-judicial activities (i.e. adjunct professor, MJI faculty, etc.) for which compensation is received.

b. Part-time judges (probate and municipal), part-time magistrates, and part-time referees who practice law must report the income from their law practices. This may be in the form of a total amount for January 1 - December 31, rather than a listing of each client and fee.

DO NOT INCLUDE:

a. Judicial/Court salary and travel expense reimbursement and payment for serving on assignments.

b. Payment received under an agreement liquidating interest in a law practice before beginning service on the bench.

c. Compensation received by newly-elected judges not holding office during the report year.

If no compensation for services was received, check "NONE."

PART 2: JUDICIAL CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS

a. Received: Write the date your detailed report of campaign contributions and expenditures was filed with the Secretary of State and list the "total" amount of receipts shown on that detailed report. Do not send this detailed report to the State Court Administrator. If no contributions were received, check "NONE."

b. Disbursed: Write the date your detailed report of campaign contributions and expenditures was filed with the Secretary of State and list the "total" amount of disbursements shown on that detailed report. If no disbursements of campaign contributions were made, check "NONE."

c. Balance After Payment of Expenses: Campaign contributions remaining after campaign disbursements shall be returned to the contributors or donated to the Client Security Fund of the State Bar of Michigan not later than January 1 following the election. (Canon 7[B][2][e] and [f].) If no campaign funds are remaining, check "NONE."

Note: The combined totals of Parts 2b and 2c should equal the total of Part 2a. If they do not, please attach an explanation.

PART 3: GIFTS  (To be completed by judges, magistrates, and referees.)

Enter the amount of all gifts having a value exceeding $100. If no gifts with a value exceeding $100 were received, check "NONE." Do not include gifts received from a relative. (Canon 5C[4].)
ASSORTED HEALTH NUTS

Contributed by Ken Randall

We’ve all heard the phrase that living well is the best revenge. What that adage doesn’t tell you is what living well means. I suppose, in the City Slickers sense, it’s that one thing you have to figure out for yourself.

In June of 2007, I attended my 25th college reunion at DePauw University. Most of my fraternity bothers were there. In spite of all our sophomoric hijinks in college, my brothers have amounted to quite an impressive group of men. There is the always enterprising Frauenheim, who sold his intranet company to IBM in the 1980s reportedly for an eight digit paycheck. Then there is “Bosco” who became lead counsel for IBM worldwide. Even our starving artist, “Gordo,” had success with creating television commercials, the most famous being the Budweiser frog series. Now, several Clio Awards later, he is very comfortable. We have a few doctors in the group as well. Then there is yours truly, the civil servant referee.

Perhaps many of you have had the same experience? When you see friends you haven’t seen for years, you fall back into the same social patterns and pecking order from decades ago. Such it was with us at our reunion. Nobody really cared too much about what we have done since college, work or family. We were happy just being together for another weekend of lost college days. And other than just being together, what really concerned us was one thing. Who is the best at Frisbee golf? As it turned out, it wasn’t me. Not even close.

On the first hole, when it was my turn to tee off, I violently flung the disc with unstretched middle-aged muscles. Immediately, I felt an electric jolt shoot down my arm from shoulder to finger tips. All the while my Frisbee veered humorously off course into tall bushes by the old fraternity house. The laughter from my brothers masked my shrieks of pain. I tried a second throw, but again felt an electric shock, and again heard a familiar laughter. I reluctantly had to quit the game, but still walked along with my friends through DePauw’s beautiful campus. Along the way we met Vernon Jordon, who coincidently was celebrating his 50th college reunion. (Many of you will recall the name Vernon Jordon as an advisor to President Clinton.) Though he didn’t say anything, I could see Vernon eyeing my shoulder which by then had moved up almost to my right ear. Two holes later, we ran into another fraternity brother, Puntarelli, who eyed me up and down, then asked, “Are you okay?” It turns out, I wasn’t.
As many of you know, that Frisbee fling was the moment that I managed to herniate three discs in my neck. Yes, at Frisbee golf. For all the football games I’ve played, traffic accidents I’ve been in, and trees I fell out of as a child, it was a simple Frisbee toss that led to my first ever surgery, a serious enough procedure to put me out of work for nine weeks. Such is life. Even I had to laugh.

After my March surgery, the doctor had me off of work until July, but I healed well enough to attend RAM’s May conference. Our first speaker, Laurie Young of *Laughter Works*, spoke of the therapeutic power of laughter. It’s interesting to think you don’t have to feel good to smile. You can smile to feel good. And it’s true. In no time Ms. Young had the group learning to “joggle,” and the Perry Hotel filled with contagious laughter. Years erased from many referee faces revealing long repressed childhood playfulness, very similar to my experience with my fraternity brothers. And, in a sense, RAM is a fraternity. It is our circle. Anyhow, it was good to share a laugh with friends.

After Ms. Young’s holistic health presentation, I couldn’t help but relate what she had said to my surgical experience and unexpectedly fast recovery. I believe I healed well because, among other things, I was able to laugh. But more than that, I am lucky enough to have family members and nutty friends who can make me laugh. Since laughter is therapeutic, in a very literal sense, my friends are “health nuts.” I wouldn’t give them up for all the Planters Peanuts in the world.

To all you “health nuts,” I know what that “one thing” is, and I am forever grateful for your allowing me to live well. It goes without saying, when you need me, I’ll be there for you too, to help you laugh through sickness, healing and pain.

In the mean time, maybe we can just share some laughs!

Ken Randall
September 6, 2008
DOMESTIC RELATIONS

A trio of Court of Appeals addressed the UCCJEA. In *Jamil v Jahan __Mich App__ (2008) (#281062 8/9/08)*, the original Mississippi order alternated custody between the parties. The Mississippi court had relinquished jurisdiction to the Virginia courts, where Defendant had moved, which then assumed jurisdiction under the UCCJEA and entered a new order. When Defendant motion’s for “non-suit” in Virginia rendered its’ order void, *ab initio*, Plaintiff filed for custody in Michigan, where he had lived with the children for 2 years. The Michigan Court properly declined to exercise jurisdiction as prior to the “non-suit” the Virginia court had assumed jurisdiction and now declined to relinquish its’ jurisdiction over the custody issue.

*Nash v Salter __Mich App__ (2008) (#282311 8/7/08)* was decided by the same panel. After the mother had moved from Texas to Michigan, the father filed for custody in Texas, then 2 months later with the 9 month old child to live with the mother. Two months later, the paternal grandparents motioned to intervene in the still pending Texas case and obtained a restraining order requiring the child be returned to Texas for custody proceedings. The Michigan trial court properly declined jurisdiction and determined that because the 7 month old child had lived in Texas since birth at the time of filing, the Texas Court had established jurisdiction in substantial compliance with the UCCJEA, and was the home state. The fact that Michigan had significant connection was irrelevant because Texas had not declined jurisdiction, and as the Texas Temporary Restraining Order did not determine custody, notice was not required prior to entry. Further, as the parents did not provide the record of Texas proceedings, they failed to show that the Texas court lacked satisfactory proofs to grant the paternal grandparents’ motion to intervene, nor that insufficient evidence was shown in the Texas Court to overcome the presumption of parental fitness to raise their child.

The court in *White v Harrison White __ Mich App __*(2008) (#272612 8/21/08) held that once a Michigan court makes a custody determination in compliance with the UCCJEA, it retains exclusive, continuing jurisdiction under MCL 722.1202 until neither the child, or the child and at least one parent, has a “significant connection” with the state, and substantial evidence of the child’s care, protection, training, and personal relationships is no longer available in the state. Although the child and mother moved back to Ontario, Canada, the father’s regular exercise of parenting time in the Michigan and meaningful relationship with the child established a “significant connection” with the state, which properly retained exclusive, continuing jurisdiction.
DOMESTIC RELATIONS, con’t

Although the mother in Empson-Laviolette v Crago __Mich App__ (2008) (#284041 9/11/08) had originally consented to guardianship and had not notified the court that she and the child were registered members of a Native American tribe or band until her motion to dismiss the guardians’ motion for custody, she was entitled to withdraw her consent to the guardianship under the Indian Child Welfare Act, 25 USC 109 et seq. Therefore, the guardians were divested of standing to proceed on their custody motion. The court in Marker v Marker SC#136721 8/7/08, in lieu of leave to appeal, ordered the trial court to conduct an evidentiary hearing on the motion to change domicile, and if the motion was granted but effectively altered the established require the movant to prove that the change was in the best interests of the child by clear and convincing evidence.

Previously in Sinicropi v Mazurek 273 Mich App 149 (2006), the trial court had declined to revoke an acknowledgement of parentage or set aside the legal father’s custody order, but entered an order of filiation for the biological father; the case was reversed and remanded as the result was 2 legal fathers. The trial court properly denied the mother and biological father’s motion to revoke the acknowledgment of paternity as they had failed to prove by clear and convincing evidence that revocation under MCL 722.1011(3) was proper considering the equities of the case, as the acknowledged legal father and the child had a significant and long-enduring bond and revocation would not benefit the child. Sinicropi v Mazurek __Mich App__(2008) (#281726 7/1/08).

The consent judgment in Laffin v Laffin __Mich App__ (2008) (#277187 8/28/08) provided that Plaintiff received a $62,500 “credit” as a full prepayment of his future child support obligation in lieu of being paid his share of the equity of the marital home that was awarded to Defendant. It further provided that if Defendant ever sought child support she would be required to pay same amount in alimony to Plaintiff. The court found the reciprocal alimony provision in the consent judgment was void against public policy as it had effect of waiving future support; the provision also failed to comply with the child support deviation factors under MCL 552.605(2), and further set alimony without considering the current circumstances or need for spousal support.

In Estes v Titus __Mich__(2008) (#133098 7/2/08) the Supreme Court agreed with the Court of Appeals that the Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act, MCL 566.31, et seq, could allow a collateral attack on a transfer of property pursuant to a divorce judgment property settlement agreement. The court held, however, that entireties property is not an asset subject to the statute as entireties property is not subject to process by a creditor with a claim against only 1 spouse. Similarly, the Court of Appeals held that absent a properly plead claim of fraud, SPTEA does not allow the Court to order a child support lien on entireties property in Walters v Leech __Mich App __(2008) (#277180 7/22/08).

MCR 3.204 and 3.212 requiring consolidation and transfer of domestic relations cases involving parents with children in common, discussed in the June article, is effective 9/1/08.

MCR 2.119 Effective 9/1/08, extends the deadline for service of a motion for rehearing or reconsideration from 14 days to 21 days after entry of an order deciding the motion.
Although no cases were published, substantial legislation was enacted:

**2008 PA 199** amends MCL 712A.19b effective 7/11/08. The court may suspend parenting time upon filing of a petition to terminate parental rights. The court must now find that termination is in the child’s best interests before terminating parental rights, rather than requiring termination parental rights unless finding that termination is clearly not in the child’s best interests.

**2008 PA 200** amends MCL 712A.19a effective 7/11/08. The Court must obtain the child’s view’s about the permanency plan in a manner appropriate to the child’s age; if the child is not to be returned home, instate and out of state options are to be considered, and if the child is placed out of state the court shall determine whether that placement continues to be appropriate and in the child’s best interests. The court must ensure that appropriate services are provided to assist a child who will transition from foster care to independent living.

If the Court determines at the permanency planning hearing that the child should not be returned to the child’s parent, the court may order initiation of termination proceedings, but is not required to do so. Unless otherwise provided in the statute, if the child has been under the responsibility of the State in Foster Care for 15 of the most recent 22 months, the court is required to order the agency to initiate termination proceedings unless:

- a) the child is cared for by relatives; or

- b) the case service plan documents a compelling reason that filing a termination petition would not be in the best interest of the child, including but not limited to: 1) Adoption in not the appropriate permanency goal for the child, 2) no grounds for termination exist, 3) the child is an unaccompanied refugee minor under 45 CFR 400.11, or 4) there are international legal obligations or compelling foreign policy reasons precluding termination of parental rights; or

- c) if reasonable efforts are required, the State has not provided the child’s family with services the State considers necessary for the child’s safe return home in the time period consistent with the Case Service Plan.

If termination is not clearly in the child’s best interests or the court does not order the agency to initiate termination proceedings, then, addition to the previously provided alternative placement plans, the court may appoint a guardian for the child with all the powers and duties under EPIC, and if so the court shall order DHS to investigate and file a written report for a review; order DHS to perform a criminal record check and Central Registry clearance in 7 days and perform and submit a home study report in 30 days, unless a home study has been performed within 1 year and the prior report is submitted to the court.

Jurisdiction over a juvenile is terminated after appointment of a guardian and a review hearing, but the jurisdiction over the guardianship continues with at least annual reviews until released by the court. The court may order DHS or a court employee to investigate and file a written report for the review.
The court may on its own motion or petition of DHS or the child’s lawyer-GAL conduct a hearing to revoke the guardianship; a guardian may petition for permission to terminate the guardianship, or request to appoint a successor guardian. The guardianship may be revoked or terminated and appoint a successor guardian or grant temporary custody to DHS if, after notice and hearing, a preponderance of evidence shows that continuation of the guardianship is not in the child’s best interests.

2008 PA 201 amends 712A.13b effective 7/11/08. The placement agency must notify the court with jurisdiction and the lawyer-GAL of a change in placement, including the reason for the change, the number of prior changes, whether the child will attend a new school, and whether the change will separate or reunite siblings or affect sibling visitation. Notice shall be by mail or electronically as agreed by DHS and the court, and this requirement does not affect the agencies ability to change the placement.

2008 PA 202 amends MCL 712A.19 effective 7/11/08. Provides that reasonable efforts to finalize an alternate permanency plan may be made concurrent with reasonable efforts to reunify the child with the family, and that reasonable efforts to place the child for adoption or with a guardian, including in state or out of state placement, may be made concurrent with reasonable efforts to reunify the child and the family.

2008 PA 203 amends MCL 712A.19c effective 7/11/08. Provides that if the child remains in placement after termination, the court may, at a review hearing appoint a guardian for the child, if it is in the child’s best interests, with the written consent of the MCI superintendent, who shall consult with the child’s lawyer-GAL prior to consent. A person may file a motion contesting a decision to withhold consent setting forth specific steps taken by the person to obtain consent and the results, the reasons why the decision was arbitrary or capricious. The court must set a hearing date for the motion, provide notice to the MCI superintendent, foster parents, prospective guardian, the child and child’s lawyer- GAL. If the court finds by clear and convincing evidence that the decision to withhold consent was arbitrary or capricious, the court may approve the guardianship without the MCI superintendent’s consent.

The child’s guardian has all of the powers and duties under EPIC; the court shall order DHS to investigate and file a written report for a review; order DHS to perform a criminal record check and Central Registry clearance in 7 days; and perform and submit a home report in 30 days, unless one has been performed within 1 year and the prior report is submitted to the court. The court’s jurisdiction over the child under 2(b) and over MCI shall be terminated after appointment of a guardian and a review hearing, but the jurisdiction over the guardianship continues with at least annual reviews until released until released by the court. The court may order DHS or a court employee to investigate and file a written report.

The court may on its own motion, or petition of DHS or the child’s lawyer GAL, conduct a hearing to revoke the guardianship; a guardian may petition for permission to terminate the guardianship, or request to appoint a successor guardian. The guardianship may be revoked or terminated and a successor guardian appointed, or the child committed to MCI, if after notice and hearing a preponderance of evidence shows that continuation of the guardianship is not in the child’s best interests.
JUVENILE LAW, con’t

2008 PA 215 Effective 7/16/08, requires DHS to establish a foster care independence program for young adults between 14 and 21 who have been placed in foster care due to abuse and neglect to help them transition to adulthood and become self-sufficient. The program must help children likely to remain in foster care in obtaining a high school diploma, and assist their preparation for postsecondary education, vocational training and life skills. DHS is to provide assistance, including interpersonal communication and life skill classes, educational support, and pay first month’s rent, utility, and security deposits to young adults in the program.

2008 PA 260 Effective 8/4/08, allows DHS to pay a subsidy to guardians of foster children if the guardian is related within the 5th degree, is the probable biological father if there is no legal father, or is the legal custodian, and has been assessed and approved by DHS, and the child resides with the guardian in the guardian’s home. The child must be a ward of the court under MCL 712a.2(b) or under the jurisdiction of MCI, there exists a condition prevents placement without a subsidy, and reasonable efforts were made by DHS to place without a subsidy, or the placement is the only one in the child’s best interests.

Did you know?

The "period under review" (PUR) for our Title IV-E audit begins on April 1, 2009 and ends on September 30, 2009?

This means that any case that is active during this time period could potentially be pulled for review. We will be allowed only 4 error cases during this next review, so it is essential that the courts and DHS continue to work together to ensure that all court orders comply with the Title IV-E regulations. During the March 2007 audit, the federal review team did not find a single court error in all cases they examined. In other words, we scored 100% in the area of courts order compliance! We want to preserve that perfect record for the courts during our next review!

If you have any questions or concerns about the Title IV-E compliance of courts orders, and they cannot be answered by your local court Title IV-E contact or the DHS funding specialists, please feel free to contact SCAO for assistance.

From the Title IV-E Listserv, Michigan Supreme Court, authored by Jenifer Pettibone
pettibonej@courts.mi.gov
As of June 9, 2008, there has been a formula for confinement obligations pursuant to an action transmittal issued on June 3, 2008. Some referees recommend orders for confinement reimbursement, and Ellen Durnan, Sr. Policy Analyst with the Michigan Office of Child Support, has provided us with some links to pertinent information.

If you are IV-D staff and have access to mi-support the website address is:  
or the public website:  
http://www.mfia.state.mi.us/ChildSupport/policy/ATbyyear.asp#AT2008-024

Briefly, the purpose of the transmittal is listed as follows in the June 3rd memorandum from Marilyn F. Stephen, Director, Office of Child Support:

PURPOSE:
To comply with the federal Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE) regulations and directives, this Action Transmittal (AT) provides IV-D staff with statewide standard formulas to calculate a confinement obligation that is enforceable by the IV-D program. These formulas will be known as the Confinement Obligation Formulas. This AT also provides policy and procedures for:

1. Recommending to the court the non-custodial parent’s (NCP’s) (or alleged father’s) confinement obligation to ensure enforceability under the IV-D program; and

2. Entering the confinement obligation in the Michigan Child Support Enforcement System (MiCSES).

The effective date of this AT is June 9, 2008.

Please see the website links above for more detailed information.
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