

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

In re:

City of Detroit, Michigan,  
Debtor.

Bankruptcy Case No. 13-53846

Judge Thomas J. Tucker

Chapter 9

**DEBTOR'S SIXTY-FIRST OMNIBUS OBJECTION TO CERTAIN  
CLAIMS**

**(No Valid Basis for any Liability of the City)**

**THIS OBJECTION SEEKS TO MODIFY, DISALLOW AND/OR EXPUNGE CERTAIN FILED PROOFS OF CLAIM. CLAIMANTS RECEIVING THIS OBJECTION SHOULD CAREFULLY REVIEW THIS OBJECTION AND LOCATE THEIR NAMES AND CLAIMS ON THE EXHIBIT ATTACHED TO THIS OBJECTION.**

The Debtor, the City of Detroit (“City”), by and through its undersigned counsel, files this objection (“Objection”) requesting that the Court enter an order, substantially in the form attached as Exhibit 1, disallowing and expunging each of the claims identified on Exhibit 2 because each such claim does not identify a valid basis for any liability of the City. In support of this Objection, the City respectfully states as follows:

**JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

1. This Court has jurisdiction over this Objection pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334 and Article VII, Section A of the Plan (defined below). This is a



core proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(b). Venue is proper before this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409.

### **BACKGROUND FACTS**

2. On July 18, 2013 (“Petition Date”), the City filed a petition for relief in this Court, thereby commencing the largest Chapter 9 bankruptcy case in history.

3. On November 12, 2013, the City filed its *Motion of Debtor Pursuant to Sections 105 and 502 of the Bankruptcy Code, for Entry of an Order Approving Alternative Dispute Resolution Procedures to Promote the Liquidation of Certain Prepetition Claims* [Doc. No. 1665] (“ADR Procedures Motion”). On December 24, 2013, this Court entered an order approving the ADR Procedures Motion [Doc. No. 2302] (“ADR Order”).

4. The Alternative Dispute Resolution Procedures (“ADR Procedures”) attached as Annex 1 to the ADR Order permitted the City to serve on claimants a

notice that the Stay/Injunction is lifted to permit the underlying claim to be liquidated in a non-bankruptcy forum consistent with the terms, conditions and limitations of Section II.E. below (a “Stay Modification Notice”). In that event, immediately upon the filing of the Stay Modification Notice, the Stay/Injunction shall be deemed modified with respect to the applicable Initial Designated Claim solely to permit the liquidation of the claim in a non-bankruptcy forum...

ADR Procedures, Section I.B, p. 4.

5. Paragraph 10 of the ADR Order states

If the Stay/Injunction is modified as a result of a Stay Modification Notice, the liquidation of each applicable Initial Designated Claim shall proceed in [. . .] such other non-bankruptcy forum selected by the Designated Claimant . . . .

6. Each Stay Modification Notice emphasized:

Note that, if you do not promptly proceed with the prosecution of the Claim(s) in the applicable non-bankruptcy forum, the City reserves its right to seek appropriate relief from the non-bankruptcy forum or the Bankruptcy Court, including, without limitation, the disallowance and expungement of the Claim(s).

*E.g.*, Stay Modification Notice, Doc. No. 9716, p. 4.

7. The ADR Procedures contain a procedure for their enforcement:

If a Designated Claimant fails to comply with the ADR Procedures, negotiate in good faith or cooperate with the City as may be necessary to effectuate the ADR Procedures, the Bankruptcy Court may, after notice and a hearing, find such conduct to be in violation of the ADR Order or an abandonment of or failure to prosecute the Designated Claim, or both. Upon such findings, the Bankruptcy Court may, among other things, disallow and expunge the Designated Claim, in whole or part, or grant such other or further remedy deemed just and appropriate under the circumstances, including, without limitation, awarding attorneys' fees, other fees and costs to the City.

ADR Procedures, Section II.G.

8. On November 21, 2013, this Court issued its *Order, Pursuant to Sections 105, 501, and 503 of the Bankruptcy Code and Bankruptcy Rules 2002 and 3003(c), Establishing Bar Dates for Filing Proofs of Claim and Approving*

*Form and Manner of Notice Thereof* [Doc. No. 1782] (“Bar Date Order”), establishing deadlines to file certain proofs of claim in this case. The Bar Date Order set the deadline to file proofs of claim as February 21, 2014 at 4:00 p.m., Eastern Time.

9. On July 9, 2014, this Court entered its *Order Pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 105(a) and Fed. R. Bankr. P. 3007 Approving Claim Objection Procedures* [Doc. No. 5872] (“Claims Procedures Order”), allowing the City to file omnibus objections with respect to claims that do not identify a valid basis for any liability of the City. Claim Procedures Order at 2.

10. On October 22, 2014, the City filed the *Eighth Amended Plan of the Adjustment of Debts of the City of Detroit (October 22, 2014)* [Doc. No. 8045] (“Plan”). The Plan provides that the City will continue using the ADR Procedures to resolve claims after the Effective Date. Plan, Art. VI.A.2, page 68. The Court retained jurisdiction to allow or disallow claims and to enforce orders it had previously entered. Plan, Art. VII. A, O, pages 69-70

11. On November 12, 2014, this Court entered an Order confirming the Plan [Doc. No. 8272] (“Confirmation Order”).

12. The Plan became effective on December 10, 2014 (“Effective Date”).

## **RELIEF REQUESTED**

13. The City files this Objection pursuant to the Bar Date Order, Section 502(b) of the Bankruptcy Code,<sup>1</sup> Rule 3007(c) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedures (“Bankruptcy Rules”), and the Claims Procedures Order, seeking entry of an order disallowing and expunging each of the claims identified on Exhibit 2 because each claimant has violated ADR Order. Under the ADR Order, each claim should be disallowed and expunged because each claimant has abandoned and failed to prosecute his or her respective claim.

14. The City filed a Stay Modification Notice against each claimant no less than eight months ago. Once a claimant has been served with a Stay Modification Notice, the ADR Order mandates that the claimant must proceed to liquidate his or her claim. ADR Order, ¶ 10 (noting that liquidation “shall proceed”). None of the claimants took the necessary steps to liquidate the claim. After more than eight months (and, in many instances, years) of inaction, the claimants “[have] fail[ed] to comply with the ADR Procedures, negotiate in good faith or cooperate with the City as may be necessary to effectuate the ADR Procedures . . . .” ADR Procedures, Section II.G. As such, the Court “may, among other things, disallow and expunge the [Claimants’] Claim[s] . . . . or grant such

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 502 of the Bankruptcy Code applies to Chapter 9 proceedings pursuant to Section 901(a) of the Bankruptcy Code.

other or further remedy deemed just and appropriate under the circumstances, including, without limitation, awarding attorneys' fees, other fees and costs to the City.” *Id.*

15. The Stay Modification Notices expressly warned claimants that failure to prosecute their Claims could result in disallowance and expungement of the Claims. *E.g.*, Stay Modification Notice, Doc. No. 9716, p. 4. The City thus objects to each claim and ask the Court asks the Court to disallow and expunge each claim pursuant to Section II.G. of the ADR Procedures.

16. To the extent the Court does not expunge one or more of the claims identified on Exhibit 2 on that basis, the City reserves all of its rights to object, on the merits and on any other basis, including without limitation, failure to comply with any applicable statute of limitations, to any of the claims identified on Exhibit 2.

### **BASIS FOR RELIEF REQUESTED**

17. The City has reviewed the claims identified on Exhibit 2 and submits that in each case the claim does not identify a valid basis for any liability under the ADR Order.

18. The Declaration of Charles Raimi, Deputy Corporation Counsel, (“Declaration”) explains the process undertaken by the City and confirms that the

claims identified on Exhibit 2 do not identify a valid basis for any liability of the City. *See* Exhibit 3, *Declaration*.

19. The Claims Procedures Order and Bankruptcy Rule 3007(c) allow the City to file this Objection as an omnibus objection. Specifically, Bankruptcy Rule 3007(c) authorizes the Court to allow for omnibus objections beyond those circumstances itemized in Bankruptcy Rule 3007(d), and the Claims Procedures Order expressly permits the City to file omnibus objections with respect to claims that do not identify a valid basis for any liability of the City. Claims Procedures Order at 2.

20. This Court has the authority to enter an order approving this Objection. Moreover, the streamlined process afforded by an omnibus objection (in lieu of individual objections to each of the claims identified on Exhibit 2) will result in material costs savings that will inure to the benefit of the City. Accordingly, the City believes that the relief sought by this Objection is in the best interests of the City and its creditors.

21. Based upon the foregoing, the City seeks entry of an order, substantially in the form annexed as Exhibit 1, expunging and disallowing each of the claims identified on Exhibit 2. Accordingly, pursuant to section 502(b) of the Bankruptcy Code and Bankruptcy Rule 3007(c), the Court should grant the relief requested.

## **SEPARATE CONTESTED MATTERS**

22. To the extent that a response is filed regarding any claim listed in this Objection and the City is unable to resolve the response, each one of those claims, and the objection by the City to each one of those claims asserted, should constitute a separate contested matter as contemplated by Bankruptcy Rule 9014. Any order entered by the Court regarding an objection asserted in this Objection should be deemed a separate order with respect to each such claim and, to the extent necessary under Bankruptcy Rules 7054 and 9014, should constitute a final judgment with respect to such claim, and the Court should expressly determine that there is no just reason for delay of the entry of the final judgment with respect to such claim.

23. The City files this Objection without prejudice to or waiver of its rights pursuant to section 904 of the Bankruptcy Code, and nothing herein is intended to, shall constitute or shall be deemed to constitute the City's consent, pursuant to section 904 of the Bankruptcy Code, to this Court's interference with (a) any of the political or governmental powers of the City, (b) any of the property or revenues of the City or (c) the City's use or enjoyment of any income-producing property.



## **NOTICE**

24. The City has provided notice of this Objection to each of the claimants identified on Exhibit 2 at the address set forth by each of the claimants on its respective proof of claim, and all other parties who have requested notice pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 2002. Given the nature of the relief requested, the City respectfully submits that no other or further notice of this Objection need be given.

WHEREFORE, the City respectfully requests that this Court enter an order, substantially in the form attached as Exhibit 1, granting the relief requested herein and granting the City such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: April 18, 2018

Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Marc N. Swanson

Jonathan S. Green (P33140)

Marc N. Swanson (P71149)

MILLER, CANFIELD, PADDOCK AND  
STONE, P.L.C.

150 West Jefferson, Suite 2500

Detroit, Michigan 48226

Telephone: (313) 963-6420

Facsimile: (313) 496-8451

green@millercanfield.com

swansonm@millercanfield.com

and

Charles N. Raimi (P29746)

Deputy Corporation Counsel

City of Detroit Law Department

2 Woodward Avenue, Suite 500

Coleman A. Young Municipal Center

Detroit, Michigan 48226

Telephone: (313)-237-0470

Facsimile: (313) 224-5505

raimic@detroitmi.gov

ATTORNEYS FOR THE CITY OF DETROIT

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

In re:

City of Detroit, Michigan,

Debtor.

Bankruptcy Case No. 13-53846

Judge Thomas J. Tucker

Chapter 9

**NOTICE OF DEBTOR'S SIXTY-FIRST OMNIBUS OBJECTION TO  
CERTAIN CLAIMS**

**(No Valid Basis for any Liability of the City)**

**PLEASE CAREFULLY REVIEW THIS OBJECTION AND THE  
ATTACHMENTS HERETO TO DETERMINE WHETHER THIS  
OBJECTION AFFECTS YOUR CLAIMS(S).**

**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT** the City of Detroit (“City”) has filed an objection to your claim because it does not identify a valid basis for any liability of the City (“Sixty-First Omnibus Objection”) and, therefore, your claim should be disallowed and expunged.

**YOUR CLAIM MAY BE REDUCED, MODIFIED OR ELIMINATED  
PURSUANT TO FED. R. BANKR. P. 3007(e)(1) AND PRIOR ORDERS OF  
THIS COURT. YOU SHOULD CAREFULLY REVIEW EXHIBIT 2 OF  
THE SIXTY-FIRST OMNIBUS OBJECTION TO FIND YOUR NAME AND  
CLAIM. YOU SHOULD READ THESE PAPERS CAREFULLY AND  
DISCUSS THEM WITH YOUR ATTORNEY, IF YOU HAVE ONE.**

If you do not want the Court to eliminate or change your claim, or grant the relief requested in the Sixty-First Omnibus Objection, then on or before **May 16, 2018**, you or your lawyer must:

1. File with the Court, at the address below, a written response to the objection. Unless a written response is filed and served by the date stated above, the Court may decide that you do not oppose the objection to your claim.

Clerk of the Court  
United States Bankruptcy Court  
211 W. Fort Street, Suite 2100  
Detroit, MI 48226

If you mail your response to the Court for filing, you must mail it early enough so that the Court will **receive** it on or before the date stated above. All attorneys are required to file pleadings electronically.

2. A copy of your response must also be mailed to counsel for the City:

Marc N. Swanson  
Miller, Canfield, Paddock and Stone, PLC  
150 West Jefferson, Suite 2500  
Detroit, MI 48226

3. You must also attend the hearing on the objection scheduled to be held on **May 23, 2018, at 1:30 p.m. in Courtroom 1925, 211 W. Fort Street, Detroit, MI 48226** unless your attendance is excused by mutual agreement between yourself and the objector's attorney.

**If you or your attorney does not take these steps, the Court may decide that you do not oppose the objection to your claim, in which event the hearing will be cancelled and the objection sustained.**

MILLER, CANFIELD, PADDOCK AND STONE, P.L.C.

By: /s/ Marc N. Swanson  
Marc N. Swanson (P71149)  
150 West Jefferson, Suite 2500  
Detroit, Michigan 48226  
Telephone: (313) 963-6420  
Facsimile: (313) 496-8451  
swansonm@millercanfield.com

Dated: April 18, 2018

## **EXHIBIT 1: PROPOSED ORDER**

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

In re:

City of Detroit, Michigan,  
Debtor.

Bankruptcy Case No. 13-53846

Judge Thomas J. Tucker

Chapter 9

**ORDER SUSTAINING DEBTOR'S SIXTY-FIRST OMNIBUS OBJECTION  
TO CERTAIN CLAIMS**

**(No Valid Basis for any Liability of the City)**

Upon review of the Sixty-First objection to claims (the “Objection”),<sup>1</sup> of the Debtor, City of Detroit, Michigan (the “City”), seeking entry of an order disallowing and expunging each of the claims listed on Exhibit 2 to the Objection; and it appearing that this Court has jurisdiction over the Objection pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157 and 1334 and Article VII of the Plan; and the Court having found that this is a core proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2); and the Court having found that venue of this proceeding and the Objection in this District is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409; and it appearing that the relief requested in the Objection is in the best interests of the City, and its creditors; and due and proper notice of the Objection having been given as provided in the Objection; and it appearing that no other or further notice of the Objection need be

---

<sup>1</sup> Capitalized terms used but not otherwise defined herein shall have the meaning ascribed to them in the Objection.

given; and a hearing on the Objection having been held before the Court; and any objections or other responses to the Objection having been overruled or withdrawn; and the Court finding that the legal and factual bases set forth in the Objection and at the hearing establish just cause for the relief granted; and after due deliberation and good and sufficient cause appearing therefore;

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. The Objection is sustained.
2. Each of the proofs of claim listed on Exhibit 2 annexed to the Objection is hereby disallowed and expunged in its entirety, pursuant to Section 502(b) of the Bankruptcy Code.
3. The City's claims agent is authorized to update the claims register to reflect the relief granted in this Order.
4. The City is authorized to take all actions necessary to effectuate the relief granted pursuant to this Order in accordance with the Objection.
5. Each claim and the objections by the City to each claim as addressed in the Objection and set forth on Exhibit 2 constitutes a separate contested matter as contemplated by Bankruptcy Rule 9014. This Order shall be deemed and constitute a separate order with respect to each such claim and, to the extent necessary under Bankruptcy Rules 7054 and 9014, constitutes a final judgment with respect to such claim, and the Court expressly determines that there is no just

reason for delay of the entry of the final judgment with respect to such claim. Any stay of this Order shall apply only to the contested matter that involves such creditor and for which such stay has been granted or may be in effect, and shall not act to stay the applicability or finality of this Order with respect to the other contested matters covered hereby, and further provided that the City shall have the right, but not the need, to submit a separate order with respect to contested matters or claims.

6. The City retains all of its rights to object, on the merits or any other basis, to any of the Claims identified on Exhibit 2.

7. Notice of the Objection as provided therein is good and sufficient notice of such objection, and the requirements of Bankruptcy Rule 3007(a) and the local rules of the Court are satisfied by such notice.

8. Nothing in this Order is intended to, shall constitute or shall be deemed to constitute the City's consent, pursuant to section 904 of the Bankruptcy Code, to this Court's interference with (a) any of the political or governmental powers of the City, (b) any of the property or revenues of the City or (c) the City's use or enjoyment of any income-producing property.



## **EXHIBIT 2: CLAIMS**

**The grounds for objection to each claim listed below is that it contains no valid basis for any liability of the City pursuant to the ADR Order. The claimant has failed to prosecute its claim and abandoned its claim. Each of the pages in the omnibus objection is pertinent to the stated grounds for objection.**

Claim Number	Name	Claim Amount	Nature	Stay Modification Notice Doc. No.
2111	Associated Chiropractic & Medical Center (re Rashad Fuqua)	\$2,900.00	General Unsecured	9716
2332	Davion Carter	\$300,000.00	General Unsecured	9244
2207	Derrick Cooper	\$150,000.00	General Unsecured	8646
2244	Dwight Houston Jr	\$150,000.00	General Unsecured	5266
2014	Edwards, Brittany B/h/n/f Dwayne Witherington	\$1,500,000.00	General Unsecured	12172
2216	Elite Chiropractic Center, P.C.	\$2,630.00	General Unsecured	12184
2574	Frank Haron Weiner PLC	\$28,280.56	General Unsecured	12200
2116	Get Well Medical Transport Co. (re S. Yharbrough)	\$76.64	General Unsecured	9159
2130	Greater Lakes Ambulatory, Endosurgical Center & Greater Lakes Anesthesia (Arnold Coleman)	\$20,805.00	General Unsecured	9372
2107	Greater Lakes Anesthesia (re Thelton Hutson)	\$615.15	General Unsecured	9373

2232	Hunt, Scecella	\$300,000.00	General Unsecured	12188
2320	Jane Doe II	\$2,000,000.00	General Unsecured	8786
1951	Jarrett, Martez	\$25,000.00	General Unsecured	12169
2261	Karim Ibrahim	Unliquidated	General Unsecured	9227
2333	Kenneth Harden	\$400,000.00	General Unsecured	9225
1751	Layla Al-Talaqani	\$100,000.00	General Unsecured	9417, 8348
2057	Lee, Nakeisha	\$25,000.00	General Unsecured	12173
1928	Lord Harris	\$1,000,000.00	General Unsecured	12167
2853	McIntosh, Rebecca	\$450,000.00	General Unsecured	8800
2848	McIntosh, Scott	\$125,000.00	General Unsecured	8798
1750	Nasreen Al-Talaqani	\$100,000.00	General Unsecured	9417, 8348
2321	Nevels, James Russell	\$350,000.00	General Unsecured	9014
2263	Omar Truelove	Unliquidated	General Unsecured	12189
1921	Pamela A. King	\$6,376.74	Priority	12165
1921	Pamela A. King	\$17,502.78	General Unsecured	12165
2177	Pamela Booker (Property Owner)	\$5,450.00	General Unsecured	10025
2218	Physiomatrix, Inc.	\$3,230.00	General Unsecured	8701
1927	Ransom, Andre Marcus	\$6,975.00	General Unsecured	12166
2112	Rehab, Inc re Rashad Fuqua	\$5,290.00	General Unsecured	9200
2141	Restorative Therapy Services (re Zoraida Carrie)	\$505.00	General Unsecured	12179
2091	Rodney Person	\$500,000.00	General Unsecured	12174
2817	Rodney Steven Howard	\$200,000.00	General Unsecured	12208
2866	Scott, Ronald Carey	\$50,000.00	General Unsecured	8457
2849	Smith, Autumn	\$450,000.00	General Unsecured	8804
2326	Stephanie White, on behalf of minor child Jane Doe I	\$5,000,000.00	General Unsecured	8787

2839	Stinson, Matthew	\$225,000.00	General Unsecured	8801
2843	Stinson, Nicole	\$750,000.00	General Unsecured	8803
1791	Tammy Barnes	\$12,475.00	Priority	4066, 3904
1791	Tammy Barnes	\$15,769.80	General Unsecured	4066, 3904
2186	Terance Calhoun	\$100,000.00	General Unsecured	9727
2209	Transmedic, LLC	\$2,403.00	General Unsecured	9415
2210	Transmedic, LLC	\$2,403.00	General Unsecured	12181
2213	Transmedic, LLC	\$9,167.00	General Unsecured	12182
2143	Transport US, LLC (re K. Ibrahim)	\$2,320.00	General Unsecured	9173
2117	Transport US, LLC (re S. Yharbrough)	\$7,422.83	General Unsecured	9172
1895	Tyler, Alante Brandon	\$350,000.00	General Unsecured	7928
1889	Tyler, Denita	\$350,000.00	General Unsecured	7927
1810	W.B. Washington - Bev	\$60,000.00	General Unsecured	9290
2878	Wendy Rickett	\$1,000,000.00	Secured	10192

**EXHIBIT 3: DECLARATION OF CHARLES RAIMI**

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

In re:

City of Detroit, Michigan,  
Debtor.

Bankruptcy Case No. 13-53846

Judge Thomas J. Tucker

Chapter 9

**DECLARATION OF CHARLES RAIMI IN SUPPORT OF DEBTOR'S  
SIXTY-FIRST OBJECTION TO CERTAIN CLAIMS**

**(No Valid Basis for any Liability of the City)**

I, Charles Raimi, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the following is true and correct to the best of my knowledge, information and belief:

1. I am Deputy Corporation Counsel for the City of Detroit ("City"). Unless otherwise stated in this Declaration, I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein.

2. The City's ongoing claims reconciliation process involves the collective effort of a team of employees assembled from personnel specifically familiar with the operations and liabilities of the City. This team works together and in conjunction with City's counsel, the City's financial advisor, and the City's claims agent, to review proofs of claim filed against the City.

3. In connection with the preparation of the Sixty-First Omnibus Objection to Certain Claims (No Valid Basis for any Liability of the City) (the "Objection"), the City reviewed the claims at issue, as described on Exhibit 2 of the Objection.

4. Each claimant has abandoned and failed to prosecute his or her claim. Consequently, each claim on Exhibit 2 should be disallowed and expunged pursuant to the ADR Order (as defined in the Objection).

5. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Dated: 4/17, 2018

By: /s/   
Charles Raimi

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

In re:

City of Detroit, Michigan,  
Debtor.

Bankruptcy Case No. 13-53846

Judge Thomas J. Tucker

Chapter 9

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that on April 18, 2018 he electronically filed the foregoing Omnibus Objection to Certain Claims (the “Omnibus Objection”) with the Clerk of the Court which sends notice by operation of the Court’s electronic filing service to all ECF participants registered to receive notice in this case. The City has engaged a Noticing Agent, which will serve the Omnibus Objection on the Claimants listed therein at the address set forth by each of the claimants on its respective proof of claim and on all parties requesting notices listed on the Master Service List, and file a subsequent Proof of Service after it has performed the service.

DATED: April 18, 2018

By: /s/ Marc N. Swanson

Marc N. Swanson

150 West Jefferson, Suite 2500

Detroit, Michigan 48226

Telephone: (313) 496-7591

Facsimile: (313) 496-8451

swansonm@millercanfield.com