

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 4059 (Substitute S-1 as reported)
Sponsor: Representative Mary Ann Middaugh
House Committee: Family and Civil Law
Senate Committee: Judiciary

Date Completed: 3-11-99

RATIONALE

The Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act (NREPA) requires a conservation officer to take possession of any and all nets, hunting or fishing apparatuses or appliances, or other property, and wild birds, wild animals, or fish, that have been caught, taken, killed, shipped, or possessed at a time, in a manner, or for a purpose that is contrary to law. The seizing officer must file a verified complaint in the court having jurisdiction and venue over the seizure of the property.

The NREPA specifies that the district court has jurisdiction to determine whether seized property is to be confiscated if the property is seized within Michigan, other than in a city having a municipal court or in a village served by a municipal court, and if the property is not appraised by the seizing officer at a value of more than \$10,000. A municipal court has jurisdiction over the seizure proceedings if the property is seized in a city having a municipal court or in a village served by a municipal court, and if the property is not appraised by the seizing officer at more than \$1,500. If the property's appraised value exceeds those limits, the circuit court has jurisdiction over the proceedings. Public Act 374 of 1996, however, raised the general jurisdictional ceiling for the district court from \$10,000 to \$25,000, and Public Act 367 of 1998 authorized the municipal courts' jurisdictional limit to be increased from \$1,500 to \$3,000, if the city in which a court is located increases the jurisdictional amount for that court by resolution of the city's legislative body. Some people believe that the court jurisdictional amounts specified in the NREPA's seizure provision should be brought into conformity with the district and municipal courts' recently revised jurisdictional limits.

CONTENT

The bill would amend the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act to increase district and municipal court jurisdictional amounts in seizure proceedings under the Act. The bill also would delete reference to the jurisdictional authority of the "common pleas court of the city of Detroit" in

those proceedings; that court was abolished in 1981. The bill would take effect on June 1, 1999.

The bill would increase the jurisdictional limit from \$10,000 to \$25,000 for the district court. The bill would raise the limit from \$1,500 to \$3,000 for a municipal court, if the city in which the municipal court was located had increased the court's jurisdictional amount under the Michigan Uniform Municipal Court Act (MCL 730.522). If the city had not done so, the limit under the NREPA would remain \$1,500.

MCL 324.1603

ARGUMENTS

(Please note: The arguments contained in this analysis originate from sources outside the Senate Fiscal Agency. The Senate Fiscal Agency neither supports nor opposes legislation.)

Supporting Argument

The bill would make the jurisdictional amounts specified for seizure cases under the NREPA consistent with the general jurisdictional limits for district and municipal courts, as revised by Public Act 374 of 1996 and Public Act 367 of 1998. Public Act 374 raised the jurisdictional ceiling for district courts to \$25,000 and Public Act 367 authorized an increase in a municipal court's jurisdictional amount, if the city in which the court is located increases the limit by a resolution of its legislative body. Maintaining separate jurisdictional limits under the NREPA will be confusing to legal practitioners and those whose claims are handled by the district and municipal courts. The bill would avoid this situation by making the jurisdictional limits under the NREPA equal to the district court's limit under the Revised Judicature Act and the municipal court's limit under the Michigan Uniform Municipal Court Act.

Legislative Analyst: P. Affholter

FISCAL IMPACT

The bill would have no fiscal impact on State or local government.

Fiscal Analyst: B. Bowerman

H9900\4059a

This analysis was prepared by nonpartisan Senate staff for use by the Senate in its deliberations and does not constitute an official statement of legislative intent.