## STATE OF MICHIGAN IN THE $6^{\text{TH}}$ JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF OAKLAND

GRETCHEN WHITMER, on behalf of the State of Michigan,

Plaintiff,

v

JAMES R. LINDERMAN, Prosecuting Attorney of Emmet County, DAVID S. LEYTON, Prosecuting Attorney of Genesee County, NOELLE R. MOEGGENBERG, Prosecuting Attorney of Grand Traverse County, CAROL A. SIEMON, Prosecuting Attorney of Ingham County, JERARD M. JARZYNKA, Prosecuting Attorney of Jackson County, JEFFREY S. GETTING, Prosecuting Attorney of Kalamazoo County, CHRISTOPHER R. BECKER, Prosecuting Attorney of Kent County, PETER J. LUCIDO, Prosecuting Attorney of Macomb County, MATTHEW J. WIESE, Prosecuting Attorney of Marquette County, KAREN D. McDONALD, Prosecuting Attorney of Oakland County, JOHN A. McCOLGAN, Prosecuting Attorney of Saginaw County, ELI NOAM SAVIT, Prosecuting Attorney of Washtenaw County, and KYM L. WORTHY, Prosecuting Attorney of Wayne County, in their official capacities,

Defendants.

Oakland Circuit Court No. 22-193498-CZ

HON. JACOB J. CUNNINGHAM

This case involves a claim that state governmental action is invalid

ORDER GRANTING TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER

## ORDER GRANTING TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDE

At a session of Court on August \_1\_, 2022 In Pontiac, Michigan at \_\_\_\_ Honorable James J. Cunningham Circuit Court Judge

This matter came before the Court on Plaintiff's Ex Parte Motion for Temporary Restraining Order.

The Court has considered the Emergency Ex Parte Motion for Temporary Restraining Order, the supporting Affidavit, and the Certification by Plaintiff's Counsel under MCR 3.310(B)(1).

The Court finds:

- 1. The Plaintiff's Motion seeks a Temporary Restraining Order prohibiting Defendants from enforcing MCL 750.14, which bans nearly all abortions in the State of Michigan.
- 2. A Temporary Restraining Order is necessary to preserve the last actual, peaceable, uncontested status quo pending further order from the Court.
- 3. The last actual, peaceable, uncontested status quo was that abortion was legal in Michigan under the framework provided in the United States Supreme Court decision *Roe v Wade*, as provided by *People v Bricker*.
- 4. The Plaintiff has established that Defendants' public statements that they will consider a case against an abortion provider should a law enforcement officer bring one to them, coupled with the Michigan Court of Appeals' August 1, 2022 decision that County prosecutors are not bound by Judge Gleicher's May 17,

2022 preliminary injunction, poses a threat of immediate and irreparable injury to the people of the State of Michigan.

5. A Temporary Restraining Order is necessary to prevent the immediate and irreparable injury that will occur if Defendants are allowed to prosecute abortion providers under MCL 750.14 without a full resolution of the merits of the pending cases challenging that statute.

NOW THEREFORE, pursuant to MCR 3.310(B), it is hereby ordered that Defendants must:

A. Refrain from enforcing MCL 750.14 until further Order of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, parties are ordered to appear via Zoom videoconferencing for a hearing on this matter on Wednesday, August 3, 2022, at 2:30 p.m. Zoom meeting ID: 248 858 0365.

 $Circuit\ Judge\ James\ J.\ Cunningham$ 

MY