

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS**

---

CHRISTINE MORRISON,

Petitioner,

v.

Court of Appeals Docket No.: 377022

Macomb County Circuit Court Case No.  
95-4609-DM

MACOMB COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT,  
FAMILY DIVISION  
HON. TRACEY YOKICH in her official capacity, and  
EDWARD HANNAFORD,

Respondents.

---

**PETITION FOR SUPERINTENDING CONTROL**

**NO ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED PURSUANT TO MCR 7.214(E)**

Filed Pursuant to MCR 7.306(A)(2),(C), and (D) for Superintending Control  
to Declare Judgment Void Ab Initio

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1. STATEMENT OF ORDER APPEALED FROM AND RELIEF SOUGHT .....4

2. STATEMENT OF QUESTIONS INVOLVED.....5

3. STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION.....6

4. INTRODUCTION.....6,7

5. STATEMENT OF FACTS &TRANSCRIPTS SUPPORTING VOID STATUS.....7

A. MARCH 8, 1999, FULL TRANSCRIPT (P.14, 20, 21): HON. PETER  
MACERONI, MACOMB COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT .....7

B. AUGUST 20, 2001, PARTIAL TRANSCRIPT (P.38, 39, 226) HON.  
TEMPLIN OAKLAND COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT .....7

6. ARGUMENT .....8,9

A. CONSENT JUDGMENTS ARE CONTRACTS.....8

B. A JUDGMENT ENTERED WITHOUT VALID CONSENT IS VOID AB INITIO.....8

C. THE RECORD TRANSCRIPTS DEMONSTRATES LACK OF CONSENT.....9

D. VOID JUDGMENTS CANNOT BE VALIDATED BY ENFORCEMENT OR TIME  
.....9,10

E. NO ADEQUATE LEGAL REMEDY EXISTS .....10

F. THE ONGOING ENFORCEMENT OF VOID ORDERS VIOLATES DUE  
PROCESS RIGHTS AND MUST BE STOPPED.....10,11

7. RELIEF REQUESTED .....11,12

8. CONCLUSION .....12,13

9. STATUTES AND AUTHORITIES.....14

10. RULES.....14

11. EXHIBITS.....14

EXHIBIT A – MARCH 8, 1999, FULL TRANSCRIPT (P. 14,20,21)

EXHIBIT B – AUGUST 20, 2001, TRANSCRIPT EXCERPTS (P. 38, 39, 226)

EXHIBIT C – AUGUST 11, 2025, TRIAL COURT ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM JUDGMENT PURSUANT TO MCR 2.612 (1)(D)

EXHIBIT D- COURT DOCKET, UNSIGNED AUGUST 19, 1997, SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND AMENDMENTS DATED SEPTEMBER 2, 1997, AND SEPTEMBER 8, 1997

## **STATEMENT OF ORDER APPEALED AND RELIEF SOUGHT**

Petitioner Christine Morrison respectfully petitions this Honorable Court for superintending control pursuant to MCR 7.306(A)(2),(C),(D) seeking immediate relief from the ongoing enforcement of void orders based on an unsigned Divorce Settlement Agreement and amendments (Exhibit D). The Macomb County Circuit Court's denial of Petitioner's Motion for Relief From Judgment Pursuant to MCR 2.612(C)(1)(d), dated August 11, 2025 (Exhibit C), fails to recognize that neither party consented to the agreement or signed it. Certified transcript evidence (Exhibit A, B) supports this lack of consent, yet the trial court has allowed these void orders to persist, continuing to violate Petitioner's due process rights.

## STATEMENT OF QUESTIONS INVOLVED

1. Whether a trial court may enforce a divorce judgment and related orders based on a settlement agreement that was never signed or consented to by either party.
2. Whether a judgment entered without valid consent is void ab initio under Michigan law and must be set aside pursuant to MCR 2.612(C)(1)(d).
3. Whether continued enforcement of a void judgment violates a party's constitutional right to due process under the Michigan and United States Constitutions.
4. Whether the Michigan Court of Appeals should exercise its superintending control jurisdiction under MCR 7.306(A)(2),(C), and (D) to vacate judgments and orders entered without jurisdiction or valid legal authority.

## **JURISDICTION**

This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to Michigan Court Rule 7.303. The Petitioner seeks this Court's intervention to correct errors and ensure proper legal procedures are followed in the underlying case, that constitutes a violation of Petitioner's due process rights under Michigan law and the United States Constitution.

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

1. Petitioner, Christine Morrison, respectfully petitions this Honorable Court for superintending control pursuant to MCR 7.306. Petitioner seeks immediate review and relief of the Macomb County Circuit Court's Trial Court Order Denying Motion to Vacate dated August 11, 2025 (Exhibit C).
2. The trial court's order failed to declare void the Divorce Settlement Agreement dated August 19, 1997, and its amendments dated September 2, 1997, and September 8, 1997, along with all subsequent enforcement orders, despite the absence of valid consent from either party (Exhibit D). Neither party signed nor consented to the agreements. Certified transcript evidence demonstrates the absence of execution or agreement (Exhibit A, B).
3. Although trial court proceedings ended in 2009, the void orders remain in effect, continuing to violate Petitioner's constitutional rights. The ongoing enforcement of these void orders severely undermines Petitioner's ability to seek justice and appropriate relief, which constitutes a violation of Petitioner's due process rights under Michigan law and the United States Constitution.
4. As demonstrated in *Gusler v. Gusler*, 338 Mich App 567 (2021), where the Michigan Court of Appeals vacated an order based on an invalid settlement agreement, the lack of valid consent and the absence of personal jurisdiction render the judgments in this case

void ab initio. Just as the court in *Gusler* held that a judgment entered without mutual assent could not stand, the same principle applies here: the judgment stemming from the unsigned agreement cannot be enforced due to the absence of personal jurisdiction over the parties and a valid contract.

5. This Petition arises from the unconstitutional enforcement of void orders, in violation of due process and controlling Michigan precedent, including *In re Ferranti*, 504 Mich 1 (2019), and *Lawrence M. Clarke, Inc. v. Richco Construction, Inc.*, 489 Mich 265 (2011).

## II. STATEMENT OF FACTS & TRANSCRIPTS SUPPORTING VOID STATUS

The certified transcript evidence unequivocally demonstrates that neither party signed nor consented to the Settlement Agreement or its amendments. Despite this clear evidence, the trial court failed to take appropriate action.

A. March 8, 1999: Hon. Peter Maceroni, Macomb County Circuit Court (Exhibit A, p. 14, 20,21)

- CHRISTINE MORRISON objected on the record:

*“I never consented or signed that, and neither did my attorney.”*

*“The validity of the consent judgment of annulment.”*

- Court: “I already ruled on that.”
- CHRISTINE MORRISON: *“I would like that to be set aside.”*

The Court acknowledged the objection and validity but denied relief, stating the issue should have been appealed, even though a void judgment can be challenged at any time.

B. August 20, 2001: Hon. Judge Templin, Oakland County Circuit Court, Legal Malpractice Proceeding (Exhibit B, p. 38, 39, 226)

- On the record, attorneys for both parties stipulated:

*"I'll stipulate that the clients did not sign either amendment or the original."*  
– Attorney Geyer

- The Court accepted the stipulation without objection.

### III. ARGUMENT

#### A. Consent Judgments Are Contracts

A consent judgment is a contract, and without consent, the judgment is void. A consent judgment is not simply a court ruling it is a contract merged into a court order. If there is no contract, no signatures, no mutual assent, then there is no judgment the court has power to enforce. Michigan law requires that judgments entered without valid consent be set aside under MCR 2.612(C)(1)(d).

The Michigan Court of Appeals, *In re Gusler*, 338 Mich App 567 (2021) reaffirmed that a judgment entered without valid consent is **void ab initio**. The court emphasized that agreements lacking mutual assent are unenforceable, echoing the principles outlined in this petition. The agreement at issue here, like the one in *Gusler*, was never executed by the parties and, therefore, cannot form the basis for an enforceable judgment.

Further, in *In re Marriage of Buehler*, 172 Mich. App. 648, 432 N.W.2d 407 (1988), the Court held that a consent judgment could only be enforced when there is mutual assent, signatures, and a valid agreement between the parties. The Court clarified that:

"A consent judgment is essentially a contract, and as such, it is enforceable only when the agreement is valid and the parties' consent is clear and unequivocal."

Courts have consistently held that enforcing a non-existent settlement agreement exceeds judicial jurisdiction. These judicial acts, being nonjudicial, fall outside the scope of lawful authority.

Additionally, *Jennings v. Metro-Goldwyn Pictures*, 9 F. Supp. 365 (S.D.N.Y. 1934), and *In re Marriage of Kelm*, 912 P.2d 545 (Colo. 1996), illustrate that without mutual consent, no enforceable judgment can arise from an agreement, further supporting the premise that absent valid consent, no enforceable judgment can be entered.

#### **B. A Judgment Entered Without Valid Consent Is Void *Ab Initio***

Under MCR 2.612(C)(1)(d), a court must set aside a judgment that is void.

- *In re Ferranti*, 504 Mich at 27:

*“A void judgment is a complete nullity and may be attacked at any time.”*

- *Lawrence M. Clarke*, 489 Mich at 276:

*“Void judgments have no legal effect and cannot be enforced.”*

- *Mullane v Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 US 306, 313 (1950): stands for the principle that a judgment obtained without due process (such as one made without consent) is void.

*“A judgment obtained without due process is void”*

Delay or procedural default or delay cannot justify the enforcement of a legal nullity.

#### **C. The Record Demonstrates Lack of Consent**

- *Kloian v Domino's Pizza LLC*, 273 Mich App 449, 452 (2006):

*“Consent as to form only does not bind a party to the content.”*

Undisputed facts:

Given these undisputed facts, the judgment is void as it lacks the foundational element of consent, a necessary condition for any valid agreement under Michigan law.

- Petitioner objected to the Settlement Agreement on March 8, 1999.
- On August 20, 2001, attorneys stipulated no signatures were made.

- No signed agreement exists in the court file. (Exhibit D)

These facts render the judgment void.

#### **D. Void Judgments Cannot Be Validated by Enforcement or Time**

- *Lawrence M. Clarke*, 489 Mich at 276:

*“A void judgment cannot be validated by enforcement or time.”*

- *Jackson City Bank & Trust Co v Fredrick*, 271 Mich 538, 544 (1935):

*“The doctrine of laches is not applicable to a judgment that is void.”*

- *Tijerina v Walters*, 407 F2d 1214, 1215 (5th Cir 1969):

*“A void judgment has no power and cannot be enforced.”*

A judgment obtained without due process, such as one entered without consent, is inherently void. As stated in *Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306, 313 (1950), a judgment obtained without due process is a complete nullity. A void judgment is not simply one that is procedurally defective, it is one that has no legal effect from its inception.

#### **E. No Adequate Legal Remedy Exists**

Petitioner exhausted all lower court remedies:

- Filed a motion under MCR 2.612(C)(1)(d)
- Submitted transcript evidence
- Relief was denied despite undisputed facts

Accordingly, this Petition is necessary to prevent continued injustice.

#### **F. The Ongoing Enforcement of Void Orders Violates Due Process Rights and Must Be Stopped**

Despite the conclusion of the trial court proceedings in 2009, the void orders stemming from the unsigned Settlement Agreement and its amendments remain in effect. This ongoing

enforcement, based on a judgment that lacks valid consent and violates due process, continues to harm Petitioner. As established *In re Ferranti*, 504 Mich 1, 27 (2019), and *Lawrence M. Clarke, Inc. v. Richco Construction, Inc.*, 489 Mich 265, 276 (2011), a judgment that is void has no legal effect and cannot be enforced at any time.

The fact that these void orders continue to be enforced, even after the formal legal proceedings end, constitutes an ongoing constitutional violation. The court cannot perpetuate the enforcement of a void judgment, nor can it use procedural default or delay as a reason to justify this ongoing injustice.

*"A void judgment has no power and cannot be enforced."* – *Tijerina v. Walters*, 407 F.2d 1214, 1215 (5th Cir 1969).

#### **IV. RELIEF REQUESTED**

The petitioner respectfully requests that this Honorable Court:

1. Issue a writ of superintending control **directing the Macomb County Circuit Court to vacate all judgments and orders based on the unsigned Divorce Settlement Agreement** dated August 19, 1997, and its amendments dated September 2, 1997, and September 8, 1997, (Exhibits D-unsigned). These judgments have remained in effect from 1997-2009 and continue to be enforced despite being void due to the absence of consent (Transcript Exhibit A, B). The petitioner requests that this writ be issued **on an expedited basis** due to the ongoing harm caused by these void orders;
2. **Declare said judgments and orders void ab initio** under MCR 2.612(C)(1)(d) and for violations of constitutional due process, including Petitioner's right to consent and to a fair

process, as the orders have been in effect from the time of their issuance in 1997 through 2009 and continue to affect the petitioner's legal standing and rights;

3. **Enjoin further enforcement of said void orders** and issue an **immediate stay** of enforcement to prevent continued harm to Petitioner, who has been subject to the effects of these void orders since their issuance in 1997, even after the formal conclusion of the trial court proceedings in 2009. The continued enforcement of these void orders is a direct violation of Petitioner's constitutional rights and access to justice;
4. **Grant immediate relief** by ordering the cessation of any legal action or enforcement related to the void orders from 1997 through 2009, which continue to impact the Petitioner despite the formal conclusion of trial court proceedings in 2009. This relief is urgently needed to prevent ongoing harm and injustice caused by these **unconstitutional and void orders**;
5. Grant any other **equitable relief, including costs**, as this Court deems just and appropriate to remedy the ongoing unconstitutional enforcement of void orders, which have perpetuated harm from 1997 to the present.

#### **CONCLUSION:**

#### **The Ongoing Enforcement of Void Judgments Creates a Dangerous Precedent that Undermines the Integrity of the Judicial System**

If left standing, the continued enforcement of void judgment in the absence of valid consent sets a dangerous precedent that the courts can uphold decisions made without due process or proper consent, eroding the rule of law. Allowing a judgment to remain in effect simply because it has been enforced over time, in the face of clear evidence that it was void ab initio, directly contradicts controlling precedent.

As the Michigan Supreme Court held in *In re Ferranti*, 504 Mich 1, 27 (2019), “a void judgment is a complete nullity and may be attacked at any time.” Likewise, *Lawrence M. Clarke, Inc. v. Richco Construction, Inc.*, 489 Mich 265, 276 (2011), reaffirms that “void judgments have no legal effect and cannot be enforced.” These principles are foundational and they apply equally here.

The Michigan Court of Appeals echoed this principle in *Gusler v. Gusler*, 338 Mich App 567 (2021), where the Court vacated a judgment based on an **unsigned and invalid settlement** agreement. The Court held that **a judgment entered without mutual assent or valid consent is void ab initio** and cannot be enforced. The same legal defect applies here.


This is not merely a matter of remedying one individual’s grievance; on May 12, 2025, Plaintiff testified to the Arizona State Senate Joint Legislative Ad Hoc Committee on Michigan Family Court Orders, affirming that Plaintiff did not consent or sign the Settlement Agreement or its amendments. It is a matter of protecting the core principles of fairness, justice, and due process that the courts are sworn to uphold. If courts can enforce a judgment without valid consent as one with no signatures or approval from either party, it creates the perception that **courts are either complicit in or indifferent to unconstitutional actions and fraudulent judicial enforcement.**

**Courts must not only correct this error in the present case but also reaffirm that void judgments will not be allowed to stand.** Permitting such orders to persist would invite further **abuse of judicial authority** and undermine public confidence in the legal system.

#### **AFFIRMATION**

I, Christine Morrison, affirm under penalty of perjury that the contents of this petition are true to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Respectfully submitted,



Christine Morrison, In Propria Persona

Date: August 26, 2025

#### STATUTES AND AUTHORITIES

1. MCR 7.306(A)(2),(C),(D) – Petition for Superintending Control
2. MCR 2.612(C)(1)(d) – Relief from Judgment
3. *Gusler v. Gusler*, 338 Mich App 567 (2021)- Invalid settlement agreement, the lack of valid consent and the absence of personal jurisdiction render the judgments void ab initio
4. *In re Marriage of Buehler*, 172 Mich. App. 648, 432 N.W.2d 407 (1988) ) –the Court held that a consent judgment could only be enforced when there is mutual assent, signatures, and a valid agreement between the parties.
5. *In re Ferranti*, 504 Mich 1 (2019) – Void Judgment can be attacked at any time.
6. *Lawrence M. Clarke, Inc. v. Richco Construction, Inc.*, 489 Mich 265 (2011) – Void judgments have no legal effect and cannot be enforced.
7. *Kloian v Domino's Pizza LLC*, 273 Mich App 449, 452 (2006) – Consent as to form does not bind a party to the content.
8. *Mullane v Central Hanover Bank & Trust Co.*, 339 U.S. 306 (1950) – Judgment obtained without due process is void.
9. *Jackson City Bank & Trust Co v Fredrick*, 271 Mich 538 (1935) – Laches does not apply to void judgments.
10. *Tijerina v Walters*, 407 F2d 1214 (5th Cir 1969) – A void judgment cannot be enforced.

#### RULES

1. MCR 7.306(A)(2), (C), (D)– Petition for Superintending Control
2. MCR 2.612(C)(1)(d) – Relief from Judgment

#### EXHIBITS

Exhibit A – March 8, 1999, Full Transcript (p.14,20,21)

Exhibit B – August 20, 2001, Transcript Excerpts (p.38, 39, 226)

Exhibit C – August 11, 2025, Trial Court Order Denying Motion for Relief From Judgment Pursuant to MCR 2.612(C)(1)(d)

Exhibit D- Court Docket, Unsigned August 19, 199, Settlement Agreement and Amendment dated September 2, 1997, and September 8, 1997

# EXHIBIT A

STATE OF MICHIGAN

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF MACOMB

EDWARD HANNAFORD,

Plaintiff,

-vs-

Case No. 95-4609-DM

CHRISTINE LYNN MORRISON,

Defendant.

COPY

PROCEEDINGS

BEFORE THE HONORABLE PETER J. MACERONI, (P-16922) JUDGE

Mount Clemens, Michigan - Monday, March 8, 1999

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff(s): In Pro Per

For the Defendant(s): In Pro Per

REPORTED BY: Susan L. Hassig, CSR-0939  
Official Court Reporter  
(810) 469-5851

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

WITNESSES: PLAINTIFF  
None

PAGE

WITNESSES: DEFENDANT  
None

EXHIBITS:  
None

MARKED

RECEIVED

12 1 Mount Clemens, Michigan

2 March 8, 1999 - at 2:42 p.m.

3 - - -

13 4 THE CLERK: Hannaford versus Morrison.

5 THE COURT: You are Mr. Hannaford?

6 EDWARD HANNAFORD: Yes.

7 THE COURT: You are Miss Morrison?

8 CHRISTINE MORRISON: Christine

9 Morrison.

10 THE COURT: Miss Morrison. This is  
11 your motion.

12 CHRISTINE MORRISON: Correct. It is a  
13 motion to set aside and vacate the interim order of  
14 the child support of July 20th of 1998. January 19th  
15 I told this Court that I've been off on a disability.  
16 There is a letter from a Dr. Miller on December 17th  
17 of 1998, there is a letter January 26th of 1999, and  
18 there is a disability certificate from 1-26 of '99.

19 THE COURT: Didn't we already hear  
20 these motions?

21 EDWARD HANNAFORD: Yes.

22 THE COURT: Do you have the file,  
23 Darla?

24 CHRISTINE MORRISON: On January 19th  
25 it was a show cause and you were informed on that day

1 that I was off on a disability, but you said I had to  
2 procedurally do you this correctly, so on February  
3 8th this same motion was heard in front of Frank,  
4 Referee Ckosasy who denied a modification for child  
5 support. This was not for a modification, this was  
6 to vacate and set aside the interim order. It should  
7 be noted that my file and my motion was not in front  
8 of him.

9 THE COURT: What do you mean it was  
10 not in front of him?

11 CHRISTINE MORRISON: He did not have  
12 my file.

13 THE COURT: Oh, the file.

14 CHRISTINE MORRISON: Or the motion.

15 THE COURT: All right.

16 CHRISTINE MORRISON: In front of him  
17 and he was told that I had two doctors' letters and a  
18 disability certificate and he denied it. I also told  
19 him that they were taking out \$50 more per week in  
20 arrearages, and also going back to the July 20th, '98  
21 order, it was ordered that I pay a hundred dollars in  
22 child care expenses.

23 Can you tell me how a hundred dollars  
24 would be reasonable for nine hours of baby-sitting  
25 per week? I would like you to refer to this document

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

from September 10th of 1996, Page 26, where the plaintiff says he works from noon to three on three alternating days per week and earns seventy-five thousand per year with medical benefits.

THE COURT: Were you referring to the final recommendation which has not yet been adopted?

CHRISTINE MORRISON: Correct. But you ordered a hundred dollars in child care expenses based on nine hours of baby-sitting a week. I don't think that's reasonable. And also if you are shown income discrepancies of a thousand dollars a week, would that verify the Court investigating?

THE COURT: Well, the Court always investigates as evidenced by this final recommendation.

MS. MORRISON: But--

THE COURT: It says, said investigation would indicate that the plaintiff's net weekly income amounts to \$404.66, and the defendant's net weekly income amounts to \$1901.74. So the investigation date, we do investigate.

CHRISTINE MORRISON: Okay. But there's also another, in '96 he claimed four hundred dollars a week, that's a significant income discrepancy, wouldn't you think? There's

1 seventy-five--

2 THE COURT: Ma'am, ma'am, you are not  
3 represented by an attorney, but it's not proper to  
4 ask me what I think or not think. You want to make  
5 statements or give me facts and figures, fine, and  
6 I'll make my decision based upon that.

7 CHRISTINE MORRISON: Okay.

8 THE COURT: Mr. Hannaford, you are  
9 employed outside the home?

10 EDWARD HANNAFORD: Yes.

11 THE COURT: What are your work hours?

12 EDWARD HANNAFORD: They vary usually  
13 from eleven until eight.

14 THE COURT: 11:00 a.m.?

15 EDWARD HANNAFORD: Yes.

16 THE COURT: To eight.

17 EDWARD HANNAFORD: p.m.

18 THE COURT: p.m.

19 EDWARD HANNAFORD: Or seven, seven or  
20 eight.

21 THE COURT: Where are you currently  
22 employed?

23 EDWARD HANNAFORD: Bill's Suburban.

24 THE COURT: Pardon?

25 EDWARD HANNAFORD: Bill's Suburban. I

1 think it's in Roseville.

2 THE COURT: What do you do there?

3 EDWARD HANNAFORD: I'm owner of the  
4 business.

5 THE COURT: What type of business is  
6 it?

7 EDWARD HANNAFORD: It's  
8 automotive-related, auto parts.

9 THE COURT: When you are at work, who  
10 cares for the child?

11 EDWARD HANNAFORD: When she gets home  
12 from school I have an au pair that cares for her;  
13 Also Druis (phoentic) is her name.

14 THE COURT: How much do you pay her a  
15 week?

16 EDWARD HANNAFORD: It's a set amount  
17 which is \$140. The total amount comes to about \$250  
18 with agency fee. Plus a car, plus educational  
19 allowance, plus food and lodging.

20 THE COURT: All right. Miss Morrison,  
21 where do you come up with three hours a week based  
22 upon that testimony?

23 CHRISTINE MORRISON: On the piece of  
24 paper that I just gave you from September of '96 he  
25 says he earns seventy-five thousand a year on

1 Page 25 working from twelve to three, and on the next  
2 page he claims he earns \$400 a week in '96.

3 THE COURT: Did you swear them both  
4 in?

5 THE CLERK: No.

6 THE COURT: Swear them in.

7 THE CLERK: Raise your right hands,  
8 please.

9 Do you solemnly swear that the  
10 testimony you are about to give in this cause will be  
11 the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the  
12 truth, so help you God?

13 EDWARD HANNAFORD: Yes, I do.

14 CHRISTINE MORRISON: I do.

15 THE COURT: All right. Sir, the  
16 testimony you just gave, in other words, working from  
17 eleven to eight or eleven to seven, that's five days  
18 a week?

19 EDWARD HANNAFORD: Yes.

20 THE COURT: And you do have someone  
21 who watches your daughter and you pay her with fringe  
22 benefits and whatever \$250 a week?

23 EDWARD HANNAFORD: Yes.

24 THE COURT: That's current?

25 EDWARD HANNAFORD: Yes, it is.

1 THE COURT: Based upon that testimony,  
2 I feel a hundred dollars a week is more than  
3 appropriate.

4 CHRISTINE MORRISON: Is it true that  
5 the child support formula in the Friend of the Court  
6 recommendation and judge's determination can vary  
7 when the formula, when there would be reason that  
8 there would be an unfair or improper applying of the  
9 formula?

10 THE COURT: If I understand your  
11 question, I think you mean is the Court obligated to  
12 follow the support guidelines? The answer is yes;  
13 however, the Court does have equitable powers and  
14 under certain circumstances can deviate from the  
15 guidelines.

16 CHRISTINE MORRISON: Is it true in the  
17 Michigan Child Support Formula Manual under Q there's  
18 special consideration in determining income of  
19 self-employed persons and business owners?

20 THE COURT: Ma'am, I'm going to say  
21 this again. It is not my function to sit up here and  
22 educate you with our legal system. Now, you have a  
23 motion, I'll listen to your motion, but I'm not going  
24 to sit up here and answer your questions.

25 CHRISTINE MORRISON: Okay. Can you

1 tell me that this is in the best interest of my  
2 daughter? In 1982 Mr. Hannaford attempted murder,  
3 his brother was accused of an open murder, all his  
4 brothers and sisters are in and out of jail, he did  
5 health care fraud in 1997 where Mr. Ricard defended  
6 him, he utilizes a travel agency fraudulently by  
7 utilizing a false I.D. number. In 1998  
8 Detective Klein and Chrysler Corporation showed up at  
9 his business for stolen core units, there was no  
10 doubt that they were from Chrysler. Also, his  
11 attorney introduced him to a Pam Vorheise (phoentic)  
12 who attempted suicide and doesn't have custody of her  
13 children. These are the individuals that my daughter  
14 is confronted with. Is this in the best interest of  
15 my daughter?

16 THE COURT: Ma'am, what motion is that  
17 on your three-page motion?

18 CHRISTINE MORRISON: What motion?

19 THE COURT: Yes.

20 CHRISTINE MORRISON: This is what's in  
21 the best interest of the child, correct?

22 THE COURT: Ma'am, I will sit up here  
23 and I will respond to each and every motion that you  
24 have raised, and that's all I will do. We are going  
25 to take them one at a time.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CHRISTINE MORRISON: Okay.

THE COURT: Set aside interim support order dated July 28th, 1998, rehearing. What's the order of July 28th, 1998?

CHRISTINE MORRISON: It was an interim order pending discovery, and it was based on a temporary basis for a hundred seventy-five per week in support and additional hundred per week in child care expenses and fifty per week in arrearages.

THE COURT: What's the basis for the rehearing?

CHRISTINE MORRISON: I was denied January 19th, and I was denied February 8th by Ckosasy who said the modification for child support motion is denied.

EDWARD HANNAFORD: Is that the order that you are supposed to give to the Court regarding your mental stability that I have here?

THE COURT: All right. February 8th of 1999, Mr. Ckosasy on behalf of Miss Liwienski recommended that the motion of the defendant for a modification of the interim support order be denied. Objections were received timely on February the 8th. Now, why are you requesting a modification of the interim support order?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CHRISTINE MORRISON: I never requested a modification. I requested to set aside and vacate the interim order of child support of July 20th, 1998 due to a disability. I have two doctors' letters and a disability certificate.

EDWARD HANNAFORD: May I see those letters and certificate, Chris?

THE COURT: Hang on, sir. Miss Morrison, if I understand you correctly you are objecting to the interim order for payment of child support, child care and child support arrearage and for health insurance coverage for minor child which was entered on July 28th, 1998 and was signed by your attorney; is that correct?

CHRISTINE MORRISON: I did not give her permission.

THE COURT: Your motion is denied.

CHRISTINE MORRISON: I have a disability.

THE COURT: Your motion is denied. This Court entered that order based upon your attorney's consenting to that order. That's a consent order.

CHRISTINE MORRISON: Okay. My second motion is the motion to compel the production of

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

documents and answers to interrogatories and taking depositions. This was heard by Referee Liewinski and within five minutes we came up here and it was heard by you. Once again, my motion was not in the file. This was ordered July 20th of 1998 that he produce these documents within thirty days of entry of this order. I have the papers in front of me, would you like to see them?

THE COURT: Yes.

CHRISTINE MORRISON: There was also an amended motion with this for post-judgment remedy and relief demanded based upon the consent judgment of annulment. I never signed the papers and my attorney never signed them, either, and I have this in front of me. Would you like to see that?

THE COURT: What's the date of it?

CHRISTINE MORRISON: The date of it is August 18th, 1997.

THE COURT: '97?

CHRISTINE MORRISON: Correct.

THE COURT: Plaintiff's response to defendant's motion to modify existing custody orders?

CHRISTINE MORRISON: No.

THE COURT: That's August 18th.

CHRISTINE MORRISON: Do you want to

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

give that to him?

THE COURT: Consent judgment of annulment. What is your issue regarding the consent judgment of annulment?

CHRISTINE MORRISON: The validity of it. I never consented or signed that and neither did my attorney.

THE COURT: Your attorney did.

CHRISTINE MORRISON: He said to form only, not content.

THE COURT: Miss Morrison, you are objecting to items that have been entered almost two years ago. And that's entitled consent judgment of annulment.

CHRISTINE MORRISON: Not without a signature.

THE COURT: That was approved as to form only, and as far as Mr. Aiello was concerned and signed by Mr. Perakis, and if there was any problem with that it should have been appealed a long time ago.

CHRISTINE MORRISON: I never consented. Can you tell me why on my docket sheet I have asked for asset discovery more than thirty times; it was granted but the orders were never

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

complied with over and over in this court? At my expense.

THE COURT: Give me a specific order.

CHRISTINE MORRISON: April 2nd of 1998, or the 29th, and then Mr. Perakis objected to--

EDWARD HANNAFORD: We had an evidentiary hearing next week scheduled for all of this.

CHRISTINE MORRISON: Liwienski's recommended order.

THE COURT: When is the evidentiary hearing?

EDWARD HANNAFORD: Next Tuesday.

THE COURT: That's--

EDWARD HANNAFORD: 16th, I believe.

THE COURT: Do either one of you have a piece of paper indicating what that evidentiary hearing will cover?

CHRISTINE MORRISON: I don't, no.

EDWARD HANNAFORD: Request for production of documents.

CHRISTINE MORRISON: He was told to produce these several times.

EDWARD HANNAFORD: I have a file here two inches thick that she has received.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CHRISTINE MORRISON: You have in front of you July 20th of '98. Those were produced without attestation to my attorney, '96 and '97 documents that are in that file for exhibits.

EDWARD HANAFORD: She keeps getting answers and doesn't like the answers and keeps requesting more and that's why we are having the hearing next week.

CHRISTINE MORRISON: I've received nothing with attestation. And on my docket sheet you will see requests for more than thirty times for depositions, production of documents.

THE COURT: What is your definition of deposition?

CHRISTINE MORRISON: A deposition.

THE COURT: Yes.

CHRISTINE MORRISON: For asset discovery. To ask, to depose him under--

THE COURT: Oh. Mr. Hanaford, was your deposition ever taken?

EDWARD HANAFORD: No.

THE COURT: My clerk just advised me that 10:30 next Tuesday that we have scheduled an evidentiary hearing regarding these issues.

EDWARD HANAFORD: That's right.

15  
1 CHRISTINE MORRISON: Correct.

2 THE COURT: So Miss Morrison, what are  
3 we doing here today then?

4 CHRISTINE MORRISON: I'm asking why  
5 this Court has failed to fine and sanction  
6 Mr. Hannaford and his attorneys for failure to  
7 comply.

8 THE COURT: Miss Morrison, I have  
9 scheduled an evidentiary hearing in connection with  
10 that matter for next Tuesday at 10:30.

11 CHRISTINE MORRISON: I understand  
12 that.

13 THE COURT: I'm hereby assessing five  
14 hundred dollars court costs for you for this motion  
15 which is frivolous based upon that hearing for next  
16 Tuesday.

17 CHRISTINE MORRISON: It is not  
18 frivolous based upon--

19 THE COURT: I just made a ruling that  
20 it is frivolous.

21 What else do you have, ma'am?

22 CHRISTINE MORRISON: I have a motion  
23 for the entry of the seven day orders, for denial of  
24 counsel by Referee Connolly, Referee Liowinski,  
25 Susan Thorman and your Honor.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

THE COURT: What do you mean denial of counsel?

CHRISTINE MORRISON: And Frank Ckasosy. They denied me my next friend to assist me and I sent them an order signing the denial and I received the orders back.

THE COURT: Let me see your orders?

THE COURT: Miss Morrison.

CHRISTINE MORRISON: Yes.

THE COURT: Is Joey-Thomas an attorney?

CHRISTINE MORRISON: No, he is not.

THE COURT: Is Joey-Thomas sitting in the courtroom?

CHRISTINE MORRISON: Yes.

THE COURT: Is Joey-Thomas the same Joey Thomas that at your last motion or second to last motion you asked him to come up here and assist you, and I asked if he was an attorney and you responded no?

CHRISTINE MORRISON: Correct.

THE COURT: And I said, Miss Morrison, it is against the law of this state for people to practice law without a license. Is that the same Joey-Thomas?

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CHRISTINE MORRISON: Yes.

THE COURT: Motion denied.

CHRISTINE MORRISON: Okay. My next motion is for an investigation of the Friend of the Court.

THE COURT: Based on?

CHRISTINE MORRISON: Based on I filed six grievances with them, and I received answers from them, and they show caused me for March 16th, three days after payroll of my check. I'm off on a disability, I have no wages, I have no income. The Friend of the Court has known this since January 19th. I have given the Court a letter from December of '98 and January of '99 and a disability certificate in January of 1999.

THE COURT: Have your grievances been responded to?

CHRISTINE MORRISON: Yes, they have.

THE COURT: Okay.

CHRISTINE MORRISON: And January 19th when I was show caused, you told Miss Thorman to schedule an evidentiary hearing, and on one of the denial responses it was said that you did not.

EDWARD HANNAFORD: I don't recall that.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

THE COURT: Anything else?

CHRISTINE MORRISON: Pardon?

THE COURT: Anything else?

CHRISTINE MORRISON: I have all, I have the transcripts here where you ordered her to give me an evidentiary hearing and they denied the validity of my grievance.

THE COURT: Anything else in regards to requesting an investigation of the Friend of the Court?

CHRISTINE MORRISON: I have a question on the MCL statutes that they have violated with answering my grievances in a timely fashion.

THE COURT: Miss Morrison, that's not the topic of a motion. There are procedures where you file your grievance. If you are not satisfied with that grievance, you can advise the Chief Judge, that matter will be looked into, but for your motion to have an investigation of the Friend of the Court is hereby denied.

What other motion do you have?

CHRISTINE MORRISON: The validity of the consent judgment of annulment.

THE COURT: I already ruled on that.

CHRISTINE MORRISON: I would like that

16  
1 to be set aside.

2 THE COURT: Motion denied. What else?

3 CHRISTINE MORRISON: That's it. One  
4 other question. I feel that you are biased and  
5 prejudicial towards me. Would you recuse yourself  
6 from this case?

7 THE COURT: Miss Morrison.

8 CHRISTINE MORRISON: I've been in  
9 front of you three times and you've denied me.

10 THE COURT: If your only basis for my  
11 so-called impartiality, not impartiality, is that you  
12 do not get favorable rulings, there is case law in  
13 the Court of Appeals which states that that ground is  
14 not sufficient for a judge to disqualify himself. I  
15 will give you every opportunity as I would anybody  
16 else, I have no animosity nor am I prejudiced against  
17 you in any way. You submit your evidence and I'll  
18 listen to it, and I'll make a decision. Your motion  
19 to have me disqualified is hereby denied.

20 CHRISTINE MORRISON: Can you explain  
21 to me why based on a disability with two doctors'  
22 letters and a certificate you are denying to vacate  
23 and set aside child support payments? I have no  
24 wages.

25 EDWARD HANNAFORD: You have five

16  
1 hundred thousand dollars in the bank.

2 THE COURT: Miss Morrison, it is very  
3 difficult to attempt to give you a legal education,  
4 and since I took the oath of office in 1991 as a  
5 circuit court judge I have given up the right to  
6 practice law, so I cannot advise you on what to do.  
7 You have some very substantial issues, that with all  
8 due respect and based upon your education and your  
9 professionalism you are not an attorney, and it is  
10 difficult if not impossible for you to adequately  
11 represent yourself in this matter, but if that's your  
12 desire, that's what you can do. And if you want to  
13 get an attorney, fine, but on one of your motions you  
14 cannot have somebody up here who is not an attorney.  
15 And there are some very legitimate reasons for that,  
16 just like no one without a license can go in your  
17 operating room and do what you do.

18 CHRISTINE MORRISON: I understand  
19 that. Then why won't you sign the denial orders?  
20 That you denied me, you made a ruling and  
21 determination on transcript you said, no, he cannot  
22 assist me, he's not an attorney.

23 THE COURT: That's right.

24 CHRISTINE MORRISON: Why won't you  
25 sign your judicial response to me?

1 THE COURT: You have an order there,  
2 and I'll sign it.

3 CHRISTINE MORRISON: Okay. I'm also  
4 asking that you have Referee Connolly, Liwienski,  
5 Frank Ckasosy and Susan Thorman sign the orders that  
6 they are denying Mr. Thomas to assist me, that's all  
7 I ask.

8 THE COURT: Well, see, here we go into  
9 the legal education again. It is not their function  
10 to sign any orders, it is my function.

11 CHRISTINE MORRISON: Okay. Could you  
12 sign it on their behalf?

13 THE COURT: No, ma'am. I'll sign it  
14 as a judge assigned to your case. They don't sign it  
15 in your case and they don't sign it in the other  
16 thirty thousand cases that they are handling.

17 EDWARD HANNAFORD: Did you prepare  
18 those documents?

19 THE COURT: Sir, I'll do the  
20 questioning. I don't know why you thought I wouldn't  
21 sign this, that's what I ruled from the bench. Take  
22 that, please.

23 THE CLERK: Are there any copies?

24 CHRISTINE MORRISON: Yeah.

25 THE COURT: What other orders that you

17  
1 have there that you would like me to sign?

2 Miss Morrison, Miss Liwienski, it is not appropriate  
3 for her to sign these orders, it's just not what is  
4 done.

5 EDWARD HANAFORD: Can I have a copy of  
6 whatever has been signed?

7 THE COURT: You'll get a copy of the  
8 order where I have hereby denied Mr. Joey-Thomas the  
9 right to represent her.

10 CHRISTINE MORRISON: How many do you  
11 need?

12 THE CLERK: You want one and one for  
13 Mr. Hannaford. You have two more?

14 CHRISTINE MORRISON: I don't on me.

15 THE CLERK: I'll make copies.

16 CHRISTINE MORRISON: Okay.

17 THE COURT: What else?

18 CHRISTINE MORRISON: That's it.

19 THE COURT: See you Tuesday at 10:30.

20 Be prepared to proceed.

21 CHRISTINE MORRISON: May I have my  
22 papers?

23 THE COURT: Yes.

24 EDWARD HANAFORD: Thank you,  
25 your Honor.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

THE COURT: You are welcome.

CHRISTINE MORRISON: And the consent judgment of annulment papers?

THE COURT: (Handing down) Anything else?

CHRISTINE MORRISON: That's it.

THE COURT: See you Tuesday at 10:30.

CHRISTINE MORRISON: Okay.

(Proceedings concluded at  
3:19 p.m.)

- - -

## **EXHIBIT B**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

STATE OF MICHIGAN

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF OAKLAND

CHRISTOPHER P. AIELLO, P.C., a  
Professional Michigan Corporation,

Plaintiff/Counter-Defendant;

vs.

Case No. 00-020759-CK  
Hon. Robert Templin

CHRISTINE LYNN MORRISON,

Defendant/Counter Plaintiff  
and Third Party Plaintiff;

vs.

CHRISTOPHER P. AIELLO, Individually,

Third Party Defendant.

-----/

Proceedings had and testimony taken in  
the above-entitled matter before HONORABLE ROBERT TEMPLIN,  
Oakland County Circuit Court, at 1200 N. Telegraph, Pontiac,  
on Monday, August 20, 2001.

APPEARANCES:

CHRISTOPHER P. AIELLO, P.C.  
26393 Dequindre  
Madison Heights, Michigan 48071  
(By: Aaron D. Geyer, Esq.)

Appearing on behalf of Plaintiff/  
Counter-Defendant  
and Third Party Defendant Christopher P. Aiello

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

DANIEL J. HENRY, JR.  
DOUGLAS A. MCKINNEY  
JOSEPH SLAVEN  
34197 Doreka  
Fraser, Michigan 48026  
(By: Mr. Daniel J. Henry, Jr., Esq.)

Appearing on behalf of Defendant/Counter-Plaintiff  
and Third Party Plaintiff Christine Morrison

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>WITNESS:</b>	<b>PAGE:</b>
<b>CHRISTOPHER AIELLO</b>	
Direct Examination by Mr. Geyer	7
Re-cross Examination by Mr. Henry	27
<b>JASON SPENCER</b>	
Direct Examination by Mr. Henry	82
Cross-Examination by Mr. Geyer	102
<b>PATRICK KEENAN</b>	
Direct Examination by Mr. Henry	129
Voir Dire Examination by Mr. Geyer	137
Voir Dire Examination by Mr. Geyer	228

EXHIBITS

EXHIBIT	MARKED	IDENTIFIED
Exhibit 16	6	8
Exhibit 17	10	11
Exhibit 18	12	14
Exhibit 19	15	17
Exhibit 20	21	22
Exhibit O	28	45
Exhibit R	61	69
Exhibit S	61	69
Exhibit T	90	92
Exhibit U	134	135
Exhibit V	202	233

1 Q. About whether or not your client refused to sign  
2 the consent judgment of annulment?

3 A. No.

4 Q. It doesn't refresh your memory?

5 A. No.

6 Q. Did you respond in writing to Mr. Perakis, that  
7 that averment was not true?

8 A. Mr. McKinney, I don't know. If you have  
9 something, will you show it to me? It's four  
10 years ago. I'd be happy to tell you yes or no,  
11 if you have it.

12 Q. And now I'm looking at this document here.

13 (Document handed to opposing  
14 counsel.)

15 Do you recall whether or not Miss Morrison was in  
16 court with you on August 19th of 1997?

17 A. I can't remember.

18 MR. MCKINNEY: This is again,

19 G, your Honor.

20 BY MR. MCKINNEY:

21 Q. Is this your signature on that document?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. So you approved, as to form, that judgment?

24 A. I can't remember.

25 Q. You don't remember?

1 MR. GEYER: Actually, that's  
2 a miscategorization, because on August the 19th  
3 of 1997, the judgment was approved by Judge  
4 Servitto, so that is not a proper question.

5 MR. MCKINNEY: Well, it was  
6 certainly entered on. What do you mean, it was  
7 approved by her? She didn't sign it.

8 MR. GEYER: There was a  
9 motion filed for entry of the order. According  
10 to the docket sheet, the motion was granted.

11 MR. MCKINNEY: Okay.

12 MR. GEYER: That's a  
13 misstatement to the Court. This was not a  
14 consent.

15 BY MR. MCKINNEY:

16 Q. Then why did you sign it if that wasn't a  
17 consent?

18 A. Whatever a judge says, you do. If the judge says  
19 go sign it; sign it. If the judge says don't  
20 sign it; don't sign it. You know that. I do  
21 what the judge tells me to do.

22 Q. So you have a recollection the judge said you  
23 must sign this?

24 A. I didn't say that, you did.

25 Q. Did you submit any objections to the proposed

1 judge's signature. It says it's a true copy. If  
2 in fact it's a true copy, this one doesn't have  
3 any signatures on it. I'm talking about your tab  
4 number three, which is an Amended Consent  
5 Judgment of Annulment dated September 2 of '97.

6 Q. I will show you from Exhibit G itself, what is  
7 tab 3, the Judgment of September 2, 1997, and the  
8 last page in particular. That has a stamp of the  
9 Court?

10 A. Yes, it does.

11 Q. But no signatures of counsel?

12 A. Or of the parties.

13 Q. Yes. Let me have that book again, please.

14 And there is a subsequent amendment on September  
15 8th?

16 A. Yes, it's --

17 MR. GEYER: Your Honor, for  
18 the purpose of to speed things up, I'll stipulate  
19 that the clients did not sign either amendment.

20 THE COURT: Okay.

21 MR. HENRY: Or the original.

22 MR. GEYER: Or the original.

23 MR. HENRY: Thank you, I'll  
24 accept the stipulation, then.

25 THE WITNESS: I can't ask a

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I do hereby certify that I have recorded stenographically the proceedings had and testimony taken in the above-entitled matter at the time and place hereinbefore set forth, and that the foregoing is a full, true and correct transcript of proceedings had in the above-entitled matter; and I do further certify that the foregoing transcript has been prepared by me or under my direction.

Tamara Fox

Tamara FOX  
RPR, CSR-4281  
TAPPERT COURT REPORTING SERVICES, INC  
26600 Schoenherr Road  
Warren, Michigan 48089  
(586) 447-3800

# EXHIBIT C

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COUNTY OF MACOMB  
16<sup>th</sup> JUDICIAL CIRCUIT COURT

**ORDER**

Case No.  
**1995-004609-DM**  
HON. TRACEY A. YOKICH

EDWARD MICHAEL HANNAFORD Plaintiff(s) Attorney: Pro Se/FTA P# \_\_\_\_\_

vs

EMAIL: \_\_\_\_\_

CHRISTINE LYNN MORRISON Defendant(s) Attorney: Pro Se P# \_\_\_\_\_

EMAIL: \_\_\_\_\_

At a session of the Court, held on August 11, 2025

**Denying Defendant's Motion for Relief  
From Judgment Pursuant to MCR  
ORDER OF 2.612(1)(d)**

Title of Order

**IT IS ORDERED:**

For the reasons stated on the record, defendant's motion for relief from judgment is denied.



*Tracey A. Yokich*

/s/ TRACEY A. YOKICH  
CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE P38377

Signed by TRACEY YOKICH on 8/11/2025 04:48:08 WND/Daja

Approved as to form and substance by:



\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of attorney for defendant

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of attorney for plaintiff

# **EXHIBIT D**

**STATE OF MICHIGAN  
IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF MACOMB**

**EDWARD MICHAEL HANNAFORD,**

Plaintiff,

vs.

Case No. 95-4609-DM  
HON: DEBORAH A. SERVITTO

**CHRISTINE LYNN MORRISON,**

Defendant.

---

**CAPUTO BROSINAN P.C.**

By: **HAROLD A. PERAKIS (P-35921)**

Attorneys for Plaintiff

29199 Ryan Road

Warren, Michigan 48092-4243

(810) 573-8900

**CHRISTOPHER P. AIELLO (P-48091)**

Attorney for Defendant

26393 Dequindre

Madison Heights, Michigan 48071

(810) 546-2211

**CONSENT JUDGMENT OF ANNULMENT**

At a session of said Court held  
in the City of Mt. Clemens,  
County of Macomb, State of Michigan,

ON:                     AUG 19 1997                    

PRESENT:                     DEBORAH A. SERVITTO                      
CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE

This cause having been brought on to be heard on the Plaintiff's  
Complaint filed herein, taken as confessed by the Defendant, and upon reading the

CAPUTO BROSINAN  
PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION  
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS  
29199 RYAN ROAD  
WARREN, MICHIGAN 48092-4243  
(810) 573-8900  
(810) 573-7695

001065

**ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

IT FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the parties have acknowledged that they have had a right to compulsory process to assist in discovery or verification of facts relevant to their respective rights and obligations in this litigation. They further acknowledge by virtue of consenting to entry of this Judgment that they are waiving such rights to the extent not heretofore exercised.

**ATTORNEY FEES**


IT IS FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that each party shall pay his or her own attorney fees, except as otherwise provided, but if any monies are due and owing as of this date, they are specifically preserved herein and are the respective responsibility of each party. Further, if any attorney fees have not been paid in full prior to the date of entry of this Judgment of Divorce, each of the attorneys shall have lien rights on any asset of their respective client and garnishment rights against the respective client's income.

\_\_\_\_\_  
CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE


APPROVED AS TO FORM AND SUBSTANCE:

CAPUTO BROSINAN P.C.

By:

  
HAROLD A. PERAKIS (P-35921)  
Attorneys for Plaintiff  
(810) 573-8900

*Approved as to form only:*

  
CHRISTOPHER P. AIELLO (P-48091)  
Attorney for Defendant  
(810) 546-2211


\_\_\_\_\_  
EDWARD MICHAEL HANNAFORD, Plaintiff

\_\_\_\_\_  
CHRISTINE LYNN MORRISON, Defendant

CAPUTO BROSINAN  
PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION  
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS  
2919' AN ROAD  
AP 48092-4243  
(810) 573-8900  
X (810) 573-7695

15/hannjud

**A TRUE COPY**

  
Carmella Cabaugh  
CLERK  
BY \_\_\_\_\_  
11

001075

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**

**IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF MACOMB**

**EDWARD MICHAEL HANNAFORD,**  
Plaintiff,

**V**

Case No., 95-4609-DM  
Hon. SERVITTO

**CHRISTINE LYNN MORRISON,**  
Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**HAROLD A PERAKIS (P 35921)**  
Attorney for Plaintiff  
29199 Ryan Road  
Warren, Michigan 48092-4243  
(810) 573-8900

**CHRISTOPHER P AIELLO, P.C.**  
BY: **CHRISTOPHER P AIELLO (P 48091)**  
Attorney for Defendant  
26393 Dequindre  
Madison Heights, Michigan 48071  
(248) 546-2211  
\_\_\_\_\_

**AMENDED CONSENT JUDGMENT OF ANNULMENT**

At a session of said Court, held in the Circuit Court,  
County of Macomb, State of Michigan

On: \_\_\_\_\_

**SEP 2 1997**

Present: Hon: \_\_\_\_\_

**DEBORAH A. SERVITTO**

**CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE**

This cause having been brought on to be heard on the Plaintiff's Complaint filed herein,  
taken as confessed by the Defendant, and upon reading the Complaint and hearing proofs taken in  
open Court, this Court finds sufficient facts, from Plaintiff's testimony, to support Plaintiff's  
request for Annulment;

**ATTORNEY FEES**

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that each party shall pay his or her own attorney fees, except as otherwise provided, but if any monies are due and owing as of this date, they are specifically preserved herein and are the respective responsibility of each party. Further, if any attorney fees have not been paid in full prior to the date of entry of this Judgment of Annulment, each attorney shall have lien rights on any asset of their respective client and garnishment rights against the respective client's income.

**DEBORAH A. SERVITTO**

**CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE**

APPROVED AS TO FORM AND SUBSTANCE:

**HAROLD A PERAKIS (P 35921)**  
Attorney for Plaintiff

**CHRISTOPHER P AIELLO (P 48091)**  
Attorney for Defendant

**EDWARD MICHAEL HANNAFORD**  
Plaintiff

**CHRISTINE LYNN MORRISON**  
Defendant

A TRUE COPY

**Camilla Sabatich**  
COUNTY CLERK

BY

DEPUTY CLERK



**ATTORNEY FEES**

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that each party shall pay his or her own attorney fees, except as otherwise provided, but if any monies are due and owing as of this date, they are specifically preserved herein and are the respective responsibility of each party. Further, if any attorney fees have not been paid in full prior to the date of entry of this Judgment of Annulment, each attorney shall have lien rights on any asset of their respective client and garnishment rights against the respective client's income.

**DEBORAH A. DEWITTO**

**CIRCUIT COURT JUDGE**

**APPROVED AS TO FORM AND SUBSTANCE:**

**HAROLD A PERAKIS (P 35921)**  
Attorney for Plaintiff

**CHRISTOPHER P AJELLO (P 48091)**  
Attorney for Defendant

**EDWARD MICHAEL HANNAFORD**  
Plaintiff

**CHRISTINE LYNN MORRISON**  
Defendant

*[Handwritten signature]*  
COPY  
Deborah A. Dewitto  
CLERK  
CLERK

No.	Filed	Action	Operator	Fine/Cost	Due
707	10/22/97	PROOF OF SERVICE	cnvMACdk95		0.00
708	10/22/97	RE-NOTICE OF TAKING DEPOSITION	cnvMACdk95		0.00
709	09/18/97	PROOF OF SERVICE	cnvMACdk95		0.00
710	09/18/97	NOTICE OF TAKING DEPOSITIONS	cnvMACdk95		0.00
711	09/16/97	PROOF OF SERVICE	cnvMACdk95		0.00
712	09/10/97	CHRIS KUHN	cnvMACdk95		0.00
713	09/10/97	DEBORAH A SERVITTO CIAVATTA	CLK A cnvMACdk95		0.00
714	09/08/97	CHRIS KUHN	cnvMACdk95		0.00
715	09/08/97	DEBORAH A SERVITTO CIAVATTA	CLK A cnvMACdk95		0.00
716	09/08/97	PROOF OF SERVICE	cnvMACdk95		0.00
717	09/08/97	NOTICE OF PRESENTMENT OF ORDER SECOND AMEND CNST JUDGMENT OF DIV-SGD	cnvMACdk95		0.00
718	09/02/97	LINDA BRAZZEL	cnvMACdk95		0.00
719	09/02/97	DEBORAH A SERVITTO FELTON	CLK B cnvMACdk95		0.00
720	09/02/97	PROOF OF SERVICE	cnvMACdk95		0.00
721	09/02/97	NOTICE OF ENTRY UNDER 7 DAY RULE AMENDED CONSENT JUDGMENT OF ANNUL DAS	cnvMACdk95		0.00
722	08/26/97	PROOF OF SERVICE	cnvMACdk95		0.00
723	08/26/97	NTC OF TRG DEPOS	cnvMACdk95		0.00
724	08/22/97	TRANS PROCEEDINGS BEFORE DAS ON 6/3/97 R/F ON FILE	cnvMACdk95		0.00
725	08/19/97	CASE CLOSED CONSENT JUDGMENT OF ANNULMENT SGD	cnvMACdk95		0.00
726	08/19/97	CHRIS KUHN	cnvMACdk95		0.00
727	08/19/97	DEBORAH A SERVITTO HARFST	CLK K cnvMACdk95		0.00
728	08/19/97	PROOF OF SERVICE	cnvMACdk95		0.00
729	08/19/97	JUDGMENT SIGNED	cnvMACdk95		0.00
730	08/19/97	PERAKIS (ENTRY OF JDMNT OF ANNULMENT) CONSENT JUDGMENT OF ANNULMENT SGD DEF SUPP BRF IN SUPT OF MTN MTN TO CHANGE CUST-DENIED, ALL PARTIES TO GO TO COUNSELING W/L HENDERSON-SGD	cnvMACdk95		0.00
731	08/19/97	AIELLO (MODIFY CUSTODY/SHOW CAUSE)	cnvMACdk95		0.00