

Senate Fiscal Agency  
P. O. Box 30036  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7536

**SFA****BILL ANALYSIS**

Telephone: (517) 373-5383  
Fax: (517) 373-1986  
TDD: (517) 373-0543

House Bill 4078 (Substitute H-2 as reported without amendment)  
Sponsor: Representative Scott Hummel  
House Committee: Judiciary  
Senate Committee: Judiciary

### **CONTENT**

The bill would amend the Revised Judicature Act to change requirements pertaining to the locations where a district court must sit in a district of the first class. (A district of the first class consists of one or more counties in which each county is responsible for maintaining, financing, and operating the district court within its respective county.)

Currently, in districts of the first class, the court must sit at each county seat and at each city having a population of 3,250 or more, except the court is not required to sit at any city that is contiguous either to the county seat or to a city having a greater population.

The bill specifies instead that, in addition to sitting at each county seat, in districts of the first class consisting of one county having a population of 130,000 or more, the court would have to sit at each city having a population of 6,500 or more, except for a city that was contiguous either to the county seat or to a city having a greater population.

(Michigan has 54 judicial districts of the first class. Of those, 10 consist of one county having a population of at least 130,000. Under current law, district courts in 24 districts of the first class are required to sit in a total of 38 cities other than county seats. Under the bill, district courts in four districts of the first class would be required to sit in a total of six cities other than county seats.)

MCL 600.8251

Legislative Analyst: Patrick Affholter

### **FISCAL IMPACT**

The bill would have no fiscal impact on State government, and an indeterminate fiscal impact on local governments. Under the bill, certain counties, which are the funding units for district courts, potentially could achieve savings by eliminating the costs of maintaining court space in multiple cities. However, as many of these counties have not been holding court in additional cities as currently required, the potential impact would be reduced. Savings also would be reduced if any courts currently sitting in multiple cities continued to do so despite the elimination of the requirement.

Date Completed: 4-29-03

Fiscal Analyst: Bethany Wicksall