

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

In re: Chapter 9
CITY OF DETROIT, MICHIGAN, Case No. 13-53846
Debtor. Hon. Steven W. Rhodes
_____ /

**CATHERINE PHILLIPS, et al.’s MOTION FOR RELIEF FROM
ORDER PURSUANT TO SECTION 105(a) OF THE BANKRUPTCY CODE
EXTENDING THE CHAPTER 9 STAY TO CERTAIN
(A) STATE ENTITIES, (B) NON OFFICER EMPLOYEES AND
(C) AGENTS AND REPRESENTATIVES OF THE DEBTOR**

Now come Petitioners Catherine Phillips, et al. (hereafter “Petitioners”) and hereby requests that this Court modify its *Order Pursuant to Section 105(a) of the Bankruptcy Code Extending the Chapter 9 Stay to Certain (A) State Entities, (B) Non Officer Employees and (C) Agents and Representatives of the Debtor* (Dkt. 166), (hereafter “*Extended Stay Order*”), to lift the Extended Stay from the matter entitled *Catherine Phillips, et al. v. Richard Snyder and Andrew Dillon*, Case No. 13-CV-11370, (Exh. 6.1, *Phillips* Complaint). In support of this Motion, Petitioners state as follows:

1. On March 27, 2013, Petitioners herein filed a Complaint in the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, naming Michigan Governor Richard D. Snyder and Michigan Treasurer Andrew Dillon (hereafter, “Defendants”) as defendants, *Catherine Phillips, et al. v. Snyder and Dillon*. Case No. 13-CV-11370, (Exh. 6.1, *Phillips* Complaint), (hereafter “the *Phillips* case”).

2. In their Complaint, (Exh. 6.1), Petitioners allege that Public Act 436 of 2012, M.C.L.A. §§141.1541 *et. seq.*, (hereafter “PA 436”), violates various federal statutory and

Constitutional rights. Petitioners sought declaratory and injunctive relief. The City of Detroit (hereafter, “Debtor”) is not, and has never been, a party to that action.

3. On July 19, 2013, Debtor filed a motion seeking to extend the Chapter 9 stay to include certain state entities, non-officer employees and agents and representatives of the Debtor. (Dkt. 56, *Motion of Debtor For Entry of Order Extending the Chapter 9 Stay to Certain (A) State Entities, (B) Non-Officer Employees and (C) Agents and Representatives of the Debtor*, (hereafter “*Motion to Extend Stay*”) Specifically, Debtor requested

that the Court exercise its equitable power under Section 105(a) of the Bankruptcy Code to extend the Chapter 9 stay to actions or proceedings against the Governor, the State Treasurer and the members of the Loan Board . . . **that, directly or indirectly, seek to enforce claims against the City, interfere with the City’s activities in this Chapter 9 case or otherwise deny the City the protections of the Chapter 9 stay.”**

(Dkt 56, *Motion to Extend Stay*, p. 13 at ¶ 20) (emphasis added)

4. In support of its *Motion*, Debtor specifically identified and discussed at length three (3) cases, referred to as the “Prepetition Lawsuits,” that had been filed in the Ingham County Circuit Court: a) *Webster v. State of Mich.*, No. 13-734-CZ (Ingham Cnty. Cir. Ct. July 3, 2013, (the “*Webster Lawsuit*”); b) *Flowers v. Snyder*, No. 13 729-CZ (Ingham Cnty. Cir. Ct. July 3, 2013), (the “*Flowers Lawsuit*”); and c) *Gen. Ret. Sys. of the City of Detroit v. Orr*, No. 13-768-CZ (Ingham Cnty. Cir. Ct. Jul. 17, 2013), (the “*Pension Systems Lawsuit*”); and *ex parte* injunction orders that had issued against the Governor and the State Treasurer in those suits that had the express purpose and effect of enjoining the defendants in those cases from authorizing a Chapter 9 filing, from taking any further action in aid of the same, and from taking any action that might lead to the impairment of pension claims. (Dkt. 56, *Motion to Extend Stay*, pp. 5-7, 14-15, ¶¶ 10-12, 22-23)

5. Debtor’s *Motion* clarified that the extension of the Stay applied specifically to the

“Prepetition Lawsuits” insofar as those lawsuits -- unlike the *Phillips* case herein – sought “...to enforce the plaintiffs’ claims against the City or to exercise control over the City’s property rights including its powers and rights under Chapter 9.” (Dkt. 56, *Motion to Extend Stay*, p. 15, ¶23, fn 4)

6. Indeed, Debtor’s *Motion* was very explicit in limiting the extension of its requested Stay to actions which “...directly or indirectly seek to enforce claims against the City, interfere with the City’s activities in this chapter [sic] 9 case or otherwise deny the City the protections of the Chapter 9 Stay.” (Dkt. 56, *Motion to Extend Stay*, p. 13, ¶20)

7. Debtor’s *Motion* – clearly in direct response to the aforementioned “Prepetition Lawsuits” — further asked that this Court enter an Order to “provid[e] expressly, for the avoidance of doubt,” that each of the identified “Prepetition Lawsuits,” be stayed pending further order of the Court.

8. It is noteworthy that Petitioners’ suit herein was not among those identified by Debtor, (Dkt. 56, pp. 5-6), insofar as the *Phillips* case had been filed on March 27, 2013, long before the filing of this Chapter 9 bankruptcy petition, while all three of the “Prepetition Lawsuits” referred to by Debtor in its *Motion* were filed between July 3 and July 17, 2013, literally days before the filing of the Chapter 9 petition herein.

9. On July 25, 2013, this Court entered the *Extended Stay Order*, (Dkt. 166), broadly extending the Chapter 9 stay to include certain “State Entities (defined as the Governor, the State Treasurer and the members of the Loan Board, collectively with the State Treasurer and the Governor, and together with each entity’s staff, agents and representatives), Non-Officer Employees and the City Agents and Representatives,” *Id.* at 2, without any of the aforementioned qualifying limitations specified by Debtor in its *Motion*.

10. While the *Extended Stay Order* (Dkt. 166) also expressly provides that “For the avoidance of doubt, each of the Prepetition Lawsuits hereby is stayed...,” this Court did not directly incorporate the Debtor’s own language, identifying the “Prepetition Lawsuits” in question, specifically, the *Webster*, *Flowers*, and *Pension Systems* lawsuits.

11. On August 7, 2013, the Michigan Attorney General’s office, through Assistant Attorneys General Denise C. Barton, Ann M. Sherman and Michael F. Murphy, filed a *Notice of Pendency of Bankruptcy Case and Application of the Automatic Stay*, (Exh. 6.2, *Phillips* case, Dkt. #29), seeking enforcement of *Extended Stay Order* (Dkt. 166) to the adjudication of the *Phillips* case. This Notice was not filed by, or on behalf of, the Debtor in this case.

12. On August 22, 2013, the United States District Court, Honorable George Steeh, entered an *Order Regarding Notice of Pendency of Bankruptcy Case and Application of the Automatic Stay*, (Exh. 6.3, *Phillips* case, Dkt. #30) (hereafter “Steeh Order”), staying Petitioners’ declaratory/injunctive relief action -- a case which challenges the constitutionality of Public Act 436 as it affects every single municipality in the State of Michigan -- despite the fact that Petitioners’ suit herein, *Phillips v. Snyder*, was not one of those specifically identified by Debtor as problematic or one that sought to enforce claims against Debtor, interfere with its activities in the Chapter 9 case or otherwise deprive it of any protections of the Chapter 9 stay. (Exh. 6.3, Steeh Order).

13. In entering the aforementioned *Order*, (Exh. 6.3), the District Court expressly noted that “it is not apparent that any interests of the City of Detroit bankruptcy proceedings are implicated” in Petitioners’ action. Nonetheless, the District Court concluded that it was bound by the terms of the “broadly worded Extension Order issued by the bankruptcy court,” and was therefore required to stay the case “unless and until such time as an order issues lifting or

modifying the stay to permit the captioned matter to proceed.” (Exh. 6.3, Steeh Order. Pp.1-2)

14. Petitioners herein, as plaintiffs in the *Phillips* case, seek an adjudication of the constitutionality of PA 436 in general, as applied to the entire State of Michigan, and not specific to any municipality, including the Debtor City of Detroit, or to the propriety or lawfulness of the Chapter 9 bankruptcy proceedings in this action. The plaintiffs in Petitioners’ cause of action are comprised of persons who represent themselves and interested organizations across the State. In addition to the proposed withdrawing plaintiffs, the cause of action consists of eighteen (18) plaintiffs representing nine (9) groups. For example, those groups with whom these plaintiffs are affiliated are: the Pontiac City Council, the Benton Harbor City Commission, the Flint City Council, Rainbow Push Coalition, the National Action Network, the Council of Baptist Pastors of Detroit and Vicinity, the Detroit Public Schools, and the Detroit Library Commission.

15. Petitioners also seek to amend their Complaint, (Exh. 6.1, the *Phillips* case Dkt. #1), to withdraw the plaintiffs Phillips, Valenti and AFSCME Council 25 as plaintiffs from the underlying action and to voluntarily dismiss, without prejudice, Count I of the Complaint, which was asserted by the withdrawing plaintiffs.

16. By this *Motion*, therefore, Petitioners herein seek relief from the Extension Order so that they may proceed in their action for declaratory and injunctive relief against Defendants (who are not officers, employees, agents or representatives of Debtor) as to the remaining counts and obtain relief from the ongoing violations of constitutional and statutory rights alleged therein.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

17. Petitioners’ pre-petition suit which is the subject of this Motion -- *Catherine Phillips, et al. v. Richard Snyder and Andrew Dillon*, Case No. 13-CV-11370 -- challenges the validity of PA 436 on a number of grounds, including the following Constitutional violations: the due-process right to elect officials who possess general legislative power (Exh. 6.1, Complaint,

Count II); the right to a republican form of government (Exh. 6.1, Complaint, Count III) ; the right to equal protection under the law with respect to race, wealth and voting rights (Exh. 6.1, Complaint, Counts IV, V and VI); the First Amendment as it pertains to freedom of speech (Exh. 6.1, Complaint, Count VIII) and the right to petition the government for redress of grievances (Exh. 6.1, Complaint, Count IX); the Thirteenth Amendment as it pertains to the vestiges of slavery with regard to voting rights (Exh. 6.1, Complaint, Count XIII) ; and the right to equal protection under the law with respect to the procedure for removing appointed emergency managers (Exh. 6.1, Complaint, Count XI). The Complaint also alleges violations of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

18. Petitioners' suit does not seek money damages for these constitutional and statutory violations, but rather only declaratory relief finding violations of Petitioners' rights as alleged in the Complaint and injunctive relief enjoining the defendants from committing further violations of those rights. To the extent that the Complaint seeks attorney fees and costs as permitted by statute,⁴² U.S.C. §1988, any such award would be paid by the State of Michigan, not Debtor City of Detroit, as neither the Debtor nor any of its agents is a party to the action.

19. Debtor's only connection to Petitioners' action against the defendants in the *Phillips* case is that Debtor is currently under the control of an emergency manager appointed by the *Phillips* defendant Snyder pursuant to PA 436. But Debtor is only one of many communities or entities subject to control by a state-appointed emergency manager. Other communities and entities currently under EM control include the cities of Allen Park, Benton Harbor, Flint, Hamtramck, Pontiac, as well as Detroit Public Schools, Highland Park Public Schools, and Muskegon Heights Public Schools. Additionally, the cities of Inkster and River Rouge are currently subject to consent agreements under PA 436, and the City of Ecorse is under the

control of a PA 436 transition advisory board.

20. If not modified to permit the *Phillips* case to be adjudicated, the net effect of this Court's *Extended Stay Order* (Dkt. 166) would be that not only Petitioners, but hundreds of thousands of other individuals throughout the State of Michigan, particularly in those communities identified above currently subject to PA 436, would be deprived of any avenue by which they can vindicate their constitutional and statutory rights at issue. Instead, under the terms of the *Extended Stay Order* (Dkt. 166) -- pertaining solely to the Debtor City of Detroit -- if not clarified or modified, Petitioners and all those within the other affected communities and entities will be forced to suffer ongoing violations of those rights while waiting for Debtor's bankruptcy proceedings to conclude.

21. By this Motion, Petitioners seek to clarify, lift or modify the *Extended Stay Order* (Dkt. 166) to the extent that it purports and/or has been interpreted to stay all litigation in which the *Phillips* defendants – Richard Snyder and Andrew Dillon – are named as parties, without regard to whether or *not* “...any interests of the City of Detroit bankruptcy proceedings are implicated.” (Exh. 6.3, Steeh Order, p.2)

22. Petitioners seek this relief so that Petitioners and Defendants may return to the District Court in order to permit an adjudication of the constitutional issues that have State-wide ramifications.

23. Petitioners contend that Debtor never asked for or intended so broad a stay as was actually granted. For that reason, the stay should not cover suits such as Petitioners', which does not “directly or indirectly, seek to enforce claims against the City, interfere with the City's activities in this Chapter 9 case or otherwise deny the City the protections of the Chapter 9 stay.” (Dkt.56, *Debtor's Motion to Extend Stay*, p. 13, ¶ 20)

24. Petitioners reemphasize that Debtor is not a party to its suit against the *Phillips* defendants, and that the defendants cannot be party to Debtor's bankruptcy proceedings. Extension of the stay to include all State officials in all cases raises serious issues regarding the validity of the Chapter 9 proceedings, inasmuch as co-mingling the identities of Debtor and the State officials for purposes of the stay casts doubt on the ability of Debtor to satisfy the basic requirement that it be a "municipality" for the purposes of Chapter 9. This is especially so because Congress intentionally deprived states of the ability to file petitions. The State Entities should not be allowed the benefits of bankruptcy protections in clear violation of congressional intent that Chapter 9 relief is afforded only to municipalities.

25. But even if this Court determines that it was proper to issue a stay broader than that requested by Debtor, Petitioners respectfully assert that under the circumstances present here, they satisfy the standard for lifting a stay under both: 1) a simple "balancing-of-the-equities" approach; and 2) a "preliminary-injunction" analysis. (See Exh. 3, Brief in Support of Motion, pp. 8-14) Specifically, Petitioners will show that the scope of the *Extended Stay Order* (Dkt. 166) was overbroad under sections 105, 362, and 922 of the Bankruptcy Code; that the *Extended Stay Order* as applied to non-debtor defendants in other cases, i.e. the *Phillips* case, does not further the purposes of granting a stay under the Bankruptcy Code; and that where, as here, the pre-petition litigation at issue involves the vindication of Constitutional rights, enforcement of the Constitution necessarily trumps such a stay.

26. The facts and law outlined herein and in Petitioners' Brief in Support (Exh. 3, Brief in Support) provide compelling support for Petitioners' requested relief from the *Extended Stay Order* (Dkt. 166).

JURISDICTION

27. Jurisdiction over this motion is conferred upon this Court by 28 U.S.C. §§ 157

and 1334. This motion is brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2)(G).

28. Venue is proper in this Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1408 and 1409.

29. The relief requested in this Motion is predicated upon 11 U.S.C. § 362(d) and Rules 4001-1 and 9014-1 of the United States Bankruptcy Court Eastern District of Michigan Local Rules.

RELIEF REQUESTED

Relief From the Extended Stay Order is Warranted Because the Debtor Never Sought a Stay Encompassing All Actions Against Defendants

30. In its *Motion to Extend Stay* (Dkt. 56), Debtor specifically identified three lawsuits (which Debtor called the “Prepetition Lawsuits”) that it claimed violated the automatic-stay protections of Chapter 9 as applied to Debtor by targeting State officials (the Governor, the State Treasurer, members of the Loan Board) to accomplish indirectly what it could no longer accomplish directly by suing Debtor. (Dkt. 56, pp. 5-8, ¶¶ 10-13; p. 13, ¶ 20; pp. 14-15, ¶¶ 22-23, including fn. 4)

31. Debtor therefore requested that the Court issue a stay covering actions against Defendants that “directly or indirectly, seek to enforce claims against the City, interfere with the City’s activities in this Chapter 9 case or otherwise deny the City the protections of the Chapter 9 stay,” (Dkt. 56, p. 13, ¶ 20) and furthermore, to expressly stay the three identified “Prepetition Lawsuits.” (Dkt. 56, pp. 14-15, ¶ 23)

32. Despite the fact that the *Phillips* case has been pending since March, 27 2013 (Exh. 6.1, *Phillips* Complaint), and the Petitioners’ claims were well known long before the filing of this bankruptcy action on July 18, 2013, the Debtor herein did not identify Petitioners’ suit as one of the “Prepetition Lawsuits” it wished the Court to expressly stay, nor does Petitioners’ suit fall within the scope of those contemplated by Debtor in Paragraph 20 of its motion.

33. Given the limiting language of Debtor's *Motion to Extend Stay* (Dkt. 56), it cannot be said that Debtor intended that all suits naming the Governor or the State Treasurer as defendants should be stayed pending the resolution of Debtor's bankruptcy proceedings and regardless of whether staying such suits would further the purposes of Chapter 9 protection as applied to Debtor. Clearly such a request would be unsupportable.

34. But the lack of such qualifying or limiting language in this Court's *Extended Stay Order* (Dkt. 166) has precisely that effect, such that the District Court in Petitioners' case indicated that it was bound by the language of the *Extended Stay Order* to stay Petitioners' suit even though it found that "it is not apparent that any interests of the City of Detroit bankruptcy proceedings are implicated." (Exh. 6.3, pp. 1-2)

35. The broadly worded *Extended Stay Order* is thus constitutionally problematic, inasmuch as Petitioners -- who petition for redresses of grievances on behalf of all citizens of the State of Michigan against the governor and the State Treasurer, in matters wholly outside of Debtor's bankruptcy proceedings -- are denied access to the courts. This is particularly so where, as here, the grievances involve claims of constitutional violations, because bankruptcy courts do not have any final authority to decide constitutional issues. *Farmer v. First Virginia Bank*, 22 B.R. 488 (E.D. Va. 1982). Any final decision on constitutional issues must, under the U.S. Constitution, be decided by an Article III court.

36. Without a modification of this Court's *Extended Stay Order* (Dkt. 166), therefore, Petitioners herein are deprived of a proper judicial review of their constitutional claims in an Article III court.

37. Further constitutional problems are created by the manner in which the *Extended Stay Order* (Dkt. 166), as currently worded, extends full Chapter 9 protection to state officials,

directly contrary to the congressional intent that such protections are not available to the states.

38. This Court can thus avoid this constitutional crisis by simply modifying its Extension Order to make clear that the stay only applies to claims, whether direct or indirect, against the res of the Debtor.

***Relief From the Extended Stay Order is Warranted Because the Scope of the
Extended Stay Order is Overly Broad Within the Limitations of the Bankruptcy Code***

39. The *Extended Stay Order* (Dkt. 166) purports to extend the “Chapter 9 stay” to cover “State Entities,” including Defendants. Although the *Extended Stay Order* does not reference the statutory provisions that constitute a “Chapter 9 stay,” upon information and belief, this Court was characterizing the automatic-stay provisions at 11 U.S.C. §§ 362(a) and 922 as a “Chapter 9 stay.”

40. By its own terms, §362(a) of the Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. §362(a), automatically stays actions against the debtor or the debtor’s property.

41. Similarly, §922 of the Code, 11 U.S.C. §922, automatically stays any action against an officer or inhabitant of the debtor to the extent that such action ultimately seeks to enforce a claim against the debtor.

42. Neither section provides a basis for staying claims against non-debtors wholly unconnected to the debtor.

43. To the extent that §105 of the Code, 11 U.S.C. §105 grants a bankruptcy court some latitude in crafting orders, including expanding the scope or duration of automatic-stay orders, such latitude is not without limits. In cases involving using section 105 to expand the scope of automatic-stay orders to non-debtors, some close nexus of identity must exist between the non-debtor and debtor (such as an agreement to indemnify) that would render an action against the non-debtor a de facto action against the debtor or its property.

44. With respect to Petitioners' District Court action, no such nexus exists or could possibly exist as between Defendants and the Debtor. Therefore, the Extension Order should be lifted as applied to the Defendants in this case.

Relief From the Extended Stay Order is Warranted Because the Extended Stay Order Fails to Further the Purposes For Which Stays are Provided in Bankruptcy Cases

45. It is well settled that the primary purposes for staying litigation against a debtor are: a) to protect all creditors by preventing financial assets or property of the debtor from being diverted to an individual creditor; and, b) to protect the debtor by preventing additional financial obligations from being imposed upon the debtor as it attempts to marshal assets and inventory obligations for the purpose of crafting a reorganization plan.

46. Moreover, such stays have the effect of preventing the debtor's limited assets from being further depleted through the expense of defending numerous suits. [While the above purposes are laudable, they are not furthered by staying Petitioners' action for declaratory and injunctive relief against the underlying non-debtor defendants in the *Phillips* case. Petitioners' action is not against Debtor's assets and does not involve any property of the Debtor. Debtor is not a party to Petitioners' action and therefore will not incur any expense defending against it. Lifting the stay, thereby permitting Petitioners to resume the prosecution of their claims against the *Phillips* defendants, will not interfere with the progression of Debtor's bankruptcy case. Thus, no harm will be suffered by Debtor if the stay is lifted as to this federal Constitutional litigation.

47. On the other hand, the injuries alleged by Petitioners are constitutional in nature and as such, constitute irreparable harm for the duration that they are permitted to continue. See, *Chicago Teachers Union v. Hudson*, 475 U.S. 292, 106 S.Ct. 1066, 89 L.Ed.2d 232 (1986); *Doe v. Duncanville Independent School District*, 994 F.2d 160 (5th Cir. 1993). Moreover, the scale

of the constitutional violations, when extrapolated across all of the individuals who reside within the affected communities and school districts throughout the entire State of Michigan, is simply staggering.

48. Under any of the frameworks used to analyze lift-stay motions, equity requires lifting the stay with respect to the adjudication of the *Phillips* case. Were it otherwise, the constitutional rights of citizens throughout the State -- in communities such as Allen Park, Benton Harbor, Ecorse, Flint, Hamtramck, Highland Park, Inkster, Muskegon Heights, Pontiac and River Rouge -- will continue to be held hostage to the Debtor City of Detroit's progression through bankruptcy despite the lack of any connection between those communities and the Debtor. Not only is such a result absurd on its face, but it is unconstitutional and contrary to public policy, particularly where such an order sets the precedent that the constitutionality of PA 436 may never be challenged so long as some community or entity subject to the Act is in the midst of bankruptcy proceedings.

49. Because the *Extended Stay Order* (Dkt. 166), as applied to Petitioners' claims in the *Phillips* case, fails to further the purposes of the automatic stay in these Chapter 9 bankruptcy proceedings as to the Debtor and simultaneously works an irreparable harm upon the Petitioners, the *Order* (Dkt. 166) should be lifted as to the claims against the underlying defendants in the *Phillips* case.

***Relief From the Extended Stay Order is Warranted Because Where the Petitioners
Allege Constitutional Violations, Enforcement of the Constitution Must Take
Precedence Over Staying Litigation Against the Non-Debtor Defendants***

50. Petitioners' Complaint alleges numerous constitutional violations made actionable against the underlying defendants, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, in the *Phillips* case.

51. Section 5 of 42 U.S.C. § 1983 guarantees persons the right to enforce the U.S. Constitution against those who act under color of law to deprive or cause a person to be deprived

of rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution.

52. Section 3 of 28 U.S.C. § 1343 guarantees a person the right to have a federal district court and a jury of one's peers adjudicate claims brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

53. Congress has clearly demonstrated its intent that 42 U.S.C. § 1983 provides the judicial remedy when a person has suffered a violation of constitutional rights. Likewise, the Supreme Court has repeatedly recognized that the enforcement of federal rights is of the highest priority.

54. In this case, the application of this Court's *Extended Stay Order* (Dkt. 166) to include all claims against the non-debtor defendants Snyder and Dillon -- regardless of the absence of any relationship to the property rights of Debtor herein or to this bankruptcy proceeding -- contravenes the very purpose and intent of Congress and the Supreme Court. Moreover, by delaying the proceedings in the underlying *Phillips* district court action indefinitely, the *Extended Stay Order* has worked a further constitutional injury to Petitioners, inasmuch as it has operated to deprive Petitioners—without any process—of the right to have their claims of constitutional violations adjudicated by the district court and a jury of their peers.

55. To whatever extent the Bankruptcy Code in general, and Chapter 9 in particular, could be read to permit the expansion of the automatic-stay provisions to include any and all actions against non-debtors even where, as here, the particular claims against those non-debtors have no relevant connection to the Debtor, such a construction is overbroad and conflicts with 42 U.S.C. § 1983. In such a case, as here, this Honorable Court should construe the Bankruptcy Code narrowly to avoid a constitutional problem or alternatively, lift the stay which avoids the constitutional conflict altogether.

56. As required by L.B.R. 9014-1(g), Petitioners have sought concurrence in this

Motion from counsel for the Debtor on September 23, 2013, and concurrence was not obtained.

CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE, Petitioners respectfully request that the *Extended Stay Order* (Dkt. 166) be clarified, modified, or lifted with respect to Petitioners' claims against the underlying defendants in the *Phillips* case, so that: 1) the constitutionality of Public Act 436 may be properly adjudicated pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §1983 by an Article III United States District Court; and 2) Petitioners may amend their Complaint to provide for the voluntary withdrawal of individual plaintiffs Phillips, Valenti, and AFSCME Council 25 and the voluntary dismissal of Count I of their Complaint, without bearing on the Debtor's rights in this bankruptcy proceeding.

Dated: September 23, 2013

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /s/William H. Goodman
William H. Goodman (P14173)
Julie H. Hurwitz (P34720)
GOODMAN & HURWITZ PC on behalf of the
DETROIT & MICHIGAN NATIONAL
LAWYERS GUILD
1394 E. Jefferson Ave.
Detroit, Michigan 48207
(313) 567-6170/Fax: (313) 567-4827
bgoodman@goodmanhurwitz.com
Attorneys for Creditor Catherine Phillips, et al.

-and-

John C. Philo (P52721)
Anthony D. Paris (P71525)
SUGAR LAW CENTER
FOR ECONOMIC & SOCIAL JUSTICE
4605 Cass Ave., 2nd Floor
Detroit, Michigan 48201
(313) 993-4505/Fax: (313) 887-8470
jphilo@sugarlaw.org
tparis@sugarlaw.org
Attorneys for Creditor Catherine Phillips et al.

Herbert A. Sanders (P43031)
THE SANDERS LAW FIRM PC
615 Griswold St. Ste. 913
Detroit, Michigan 48226
(313) 962-0099/Fax: (313) 962-0044
haslawpc@gmail.com
Attorneys for Creditor Catherine Phillips et al.

Darius Charney
Ghita Schwarz
CENTER FOR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS
666 Broadway, 7th floor
New York, New York 10012
(212) 614-6464/Fax: (212) 614-6499
dcharney@ccrjustice.org
Attorneys for Creditor Catherine Phillips et al.

Richard G. Mack, Jr. (P58657)
Keith D. Flynn (P74192)
MILLER COHEN, P.L.C.
600 W. Lafayette Blvd., 4th Floor
Detroit, Michigan 48226
(313) 964-4454/Fax: (313) 964-4490
richardmack@millercohen.com
Attorneys for Creditor Catherine Phillips et al.

Cynthia Heenan (P53664)
Hugh M. Davis (P12555)
Attorneys for Plaintiffs
CONSTITUTIONAL LITIGATION
ASSOCIATES, P.C.
450 W. Fort St., Suite 200
Detroit, MI 48226
313-961-2255/Fax: 313-961-5999
Attorneys for Creditor Catherine Phillips et al.