

(An electronic version of this petition with live links is available online as the 20260717_Petition_for_Sanctions_n_Redress Attachment at <https://usareset.net/forum/viewtopic.php?p=258#p258>.)

July 17, 2026

Governor Gretchen Whitmer, P.O. Box 30013, Lansing, MI 48909

Dana Nessel, Attorney General, P.O. Box 30212, Lansing, MI 48909

Julie Brixie, N-1092 House Office Building, P.O. Box 30014, Lansing, MI 48909-7514

Matt Hall, Speaker of the House, P.O. Box 30014, Lansing, MI 48909-7514

Sam Singh, S-8, Capitol Building, P.O. Box 30036, Lansing, MI 48909-7536

Senator Winnie Brinks, P. O. Box 30036, Lansing, MI 48909-7536

Chief Justice Megan Cavanagh, Michigan Supreme Court, P.O. Box 30052, Lansing, MI 48909

Justice Richard Bernstein, Michigan Supreme Court, P.O. Box 30052, Lansing, MI 48909

Various news media and social media.

Petition to Michigan for Redress of Grievances

Dear People:

“Justice” is the 17th word of the U.S. Constitution (or first among the ways “to form a more perfect Union”)¹ and the U.S. Constitution is the “supreme Law of the Land” “and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby”². Additionally, “the Members of the several State Legislatures, and all executive and judicial Officers, both of the United States and of the several States, shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution³.” Meaning that neither the State of Michigan nor its people can override the U.S. Constitution. Further, the U.S. Constitution acknowledges a right of the people “to petition the Government for a redress of grievances”⁴ as does the Constitution of Michigan of 1963⁵ recognize the right “to petition the government for redress of grievances”^{6,7}

¹ Both preceding quotes from the United States Constitution Preamble.

² Both the preceding quotes U.S. Constitution Article VI, Clause 2.

³ U.S. Constitution Article VI, Clause 3.

⁴ U.S. Constitution Amendment I.

⁵ Generally: Michigan Constitution

⁶ Constitution of Michigan of 1963 Article I, § 3.

⁷ A scholar.google.com (Articles and/or Case law) and/or google.com search for these petition phrases will find much that shows these ancient rights have been severely (much by various court actions)

This document is such a petition to the State of Michigan and is presented via copies of this document, and its referenced material, to parties in all three branches (“legislative, executive and judicial”⁸) of the Government of the State of Michigan. It should not be necessary but it needs to be noted that the “separation of powers” is not total but intentionally includes checks and balances “as expressly provided in this constitution⁹.” Among others¹⁰ is Michigan Constitution Article VI, § 25:

For reasonable cause, which is not sufficient ground for impeachment¹¹, the governor shall remove any judge on a concurrent resolution of two-thirds of the members elected to and serving in each house of the legislature. The cause for removal shall be stated at length in the resolution.

As can clearly be seen here the “governor” and “legislature” both have responsibilities for keeping the judiciary of Michigan just.¹² Additionally, there are the State Bar of Michigan, the (Michigan) Attorney Grievance Commission, the (Michigan) Attorney Discipline Board, and the Michigan Judicial Tenure Commission which the governor or legislature can call upon for disciplinary actions against attorneys/lawyers and which may fall short of complete removal of judges and justices. Perhaps a citizen could call upon these organizations also but the expectation of this Petitioner, James Edward White, is that attorneys in those organizations would fall back on “it was decided by a court” whereas for certain the governor and the legislature have the extra responsibility of overseeing the courts. Those organizations also could not exceed their bounds and actually provide redress to Petitioner as the Governor and/or Legislature can.

This Petition document will not repeat the hundreds of pages of filings or their exhibits but will provide links as appropriate and specific document page references¹³. This document will also only cover the first State of Michigan violation

undercut from what the U.S. Constitution intended since in England during colonial America the King could be “petitioned” (a soft word rather than “sued”) and the courts (including Parliament acting as a supreme court) would by default (or King response) take action to “do right.” The U.S. and Michigan Constitutions themselves indicate how they can be amended and neither courts nor legislatures can constitutionally undercut the right to petition the State of Michigan for redress.

⁸ Constitution of Michigan of 1963 Article III, § 2.

⁹ Constitution of Michigan of 1963 Article III, § 2.

¹⁰ For an example of another “other” see Michigan Constitution of 1963 Article VI, § 30.

¹¹ Impeachment is discussed in Michigan Constitution Article XI, § 7 and violation (intentional or accidental) of the oath of Michigan Constitution Article XI, § 1 should certainly meet the requirements for at least one of impeachment or “reasonable cause” and for licensed attorneys (including Michigan judges and justices) the paragraph following the quote should suffice.

¹² In a Constitutional Republican Democracy it is of the essence that the Legislature selected by the people creates laws and that the Executive branch, with the aid of the Judicial branch, ensure the laws are followed. The executive branch with judiciary support cannot ignore law or constitution.

¹³ For greatest efficiency it is recommended that the following documents be downloaded then the PDF “Go to a specific page number” feature of a PDF reader be used:

100 page Summary of the cases (Petition for Redress of Grievances to the United States Senate <https://usareset.net/forum/download/file.php?id=29>)

of Petitioner's rights which the State of Michigan has subsequently compounded, with full assistance from the U.S. Government, in order (apparently) to "win" for the State of Michigan Government rather than do "Justice" for "the People."¹⁴

MCL 421.48(2): All amounts paid to a claimant by an employing unit or former employing unit for a vacation or a holiday ... **as the result of the separation** [layoff], ... shall be considered remuneration ... in determining his or her benefit payments under section 27(c).... ***However, payments for a vacation or holiday, or the right to which has irrevocably vested, after 14 days following a vacation or holiday shall not be considered wages or remuneration within the meaning of this section.***¹⁵

Michigan State University laid off Petitioner¹⁶ then, through deceptive records¹⁷ and documentation¹⁸, got the Michigan Unemployment Insurance Agency (UIA) to deny Petitioner \$362¹⁹ in unemployment compensation (MSU's actual intent was for denial of \$724, see footnote 18 period from – to dates). The UIA accepted MSU's deception ignoring that MSU was mandated by UIA to provide contract or policy documentation²⁰ that the payment was by contract/policy "as the result of the [layoff]" and not "irrevocably vested" "vacation." MSU provided no such

U.S. Supreme Court Petition for Rehearing, Main Document

https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/22/22-387/254109/20230206153942694_20230206-153522-00004142-000000007.pdf

<https://usareset.net/forum/download/file.php?id=4> 20-301-AE-

C30_JamesWhiteVsMSU20200730_UIAC_Appeal_Brief_Appendix_reduced.pdf

Also recommended is to visit

<https://www.supremecourt.gov/search.aspx?filename=/docket/docketfiles/html/public/22-387.html> to access all of the documentation as provided to the U.S. Supreme Court

NOTE: Depending on web page, web browser, PDF reader, and your configuration choices, links in this document to PDFs may not go directly to a specified page, you may have to access the specific page yourself.

¹⁴ **NOTE: Before getting into the weeds of this document and it's links it may be easiest to get an overview of parts of the cases from an 8-page introduction including proof exhibits (<https://usareset.net/forum/download/file.php?id=31>) or the 100 page Summary with 24 pages of double spaced text and 72 pages of exhibits listed first in the prior footnote.**

¹⁵ <https://usareset.net/forum/download/file.php?id=29> page 32 and page 33 or

<https://usareset.net/forum/download/file.php?id=31> page 5 (easiest read/comprehension) or

<https://usareset.net/forum/download/file.php?id=4> page 118

¹⁶ <https://usareset.net/forum/download/file.php?id=4> page 58 (Or as a single page on Bluesky <https://bsky.app/profile/jim-at-usareset.bsky.social/post/3liwxiexrks2i>)

¹⁷ <https://bsky.app/profile/jim-at-usareset.bsky.social/post/3ljdqspufic22> (second image of top post) or <https://usareset.net/forum/download/file.php?id=29> page 48

¹⁸ <https://usareset.net/forum/download/file.php?id=4> page 71 and 72 or 134 (also <https://bsky.app/profile/jim-at-usareset.bsky.social/post/3ljdqspufic22> first image)

¹⁹ <https://usareset.net/forum/download/file.php?id=4> page 69 vs page 67 or <https://bsky.app/profile/jim-at-usareset.bsky.social/post/3lj4ber3v5c2o> (first image)

²⁰ <https://usareset.net/forum/download/file.php?id=4> page 134 4th question or <https://usareset.net/forum/download/file.php?id=29> page 56 & 57

documentation while petitioner provided absolute documentation to the contrary²¹ only to see it completely ignored by an ALJ²², the MCAC/UIAC²³, and the Michigan Courts. MSU and the UIAC then effectively stonewalled the U.S. Supreme Court²⁴ which ignored its own obligation, in a case in which a State is involved²⁵, to adhere to (at least) the U.S. Constitution Amendment IX right to understand law in plain English²⁶.

The State of Michigan attorneys arguing in support of the UIA, while quoting the words, completely ignored the “However” and “or the right to which has irrevocably vested”²⁷ of the law. The words, in plain English, mean: “However” = disregarding the prior sentence on “holiday or vacation” given “as the result of the separation”; “or the right to which has irrevocably vested” = either subsume into the words/phrase “vacation or holiday” in this sentence also any “irrevocably vested” “right” to a vacation or holiday or read the “or” phrase on its own; “after 14 days following” = payments not within 14 days of completion of a “vacation or holiday [time period given] ... as the result of the separation” (or 14 days after vesting) are not “wages or remuneration” as counted “under section 27(c).”

The “However” sentence could probably have been better written in more words as, for example:

However, payments for a vacation or holiday given as a result of the separation and made more than 14 days after such vacation or holiday, or payments for a vacation or holiday the right to which has irrevocably vested, shall not be considered wages or remuneration within the meaning of this section.

The intent clearly being an employer cannot rob an employee of vested vacation or holiday, without a contract allowing such (per the first sentence of 48(2)), and an employer granting a paid vacation period as the result of a layoff must pay within 14 days of said paid vacation or holiday or the payment cannot be used to reduce the due unemployment compensation.

²¹ <https://usareset.net/forum/download/file.php?id=4> pages 50-56, particularly -157 and -159 on 51, and -171 on 52 noting that unused vacation is to be paid out on termination, not layoff. The distinctions between termination and layoff are made clear on pages 53-56

²² <https://usareset.net/forum/download/file.php?id=4> pages 8-13, 50-59, 64-66, 83-84, 90. Particularly see pages 12, 13, 64-66, 83, 84, and 90.

²³ <https://usareset.net/forum/download/file.php?id=4> pages 86 and 98-116. Particularly 98, 101-105, and 115.

²⁴ <https://www.supremecourt.gov/search.aspx?filename=/docket/docketfiles/html/public/22-387.html> November 19, 2022 and December 1, 2022

²⁵ U.S. Constitution Article III, § 2, Clause 2

²⁶ https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/22/22-387/254109/20230206153942694_20230206-153522-00004142-00000007.pdf#page=13 to page 15 (numbered 8 to 10)

²⁷ https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/22/22-387/254109/20230206153942694_20230206-153522-00004142-00000007.pdf#page=10 and page 11 (numbered 5 and 6)

Payment for Petitioner's contractually irrevocably vested right to vacation could not be counted as wages or remuneration and regardless the vesting occurred more than 14 days prior to any payment for the earned vacation: August 31, 2017 vesting of 4 weekly hours of vacation with payment on September 29, 2017 for (supposedly, but incorrectly) 94 hours of accrued vacation time²⁸.

Yes, the law is complex. But Petitioner understood it after only a couple of readings. It is not ambiguous when reading it so that no part of 27(c) or 48(2) are nullified²⁹. Petitioner also understood that MSU's plan to cheat on the MSU/APA union contract and MSU policy and MSU's unemployment insurance obligations was based on the "You will be continued on the payroll..." sentence in the layoff letter and other deceptive documentation that sought to escape adherence to the law.

Apologies for it being so tedious to review this information. It would have been far simpler for the UIA (and/or the ALJ) to properly review and act on Petitioner's initial write-up on appeal to an ALJ of the UIA decision citing much of the relevant wording of Michigan law based on Petitioner's initial reading.³⁰

REDRESS REQUESTED

1. The \$362.00³¹ unemployment insurance payment that was omitted.
2. The \$389.44³² vacation payout shortage resulting from (at least) two arithmetic errors.
3. The \$177.75³³ denied in Costs for the Superintending Control Complaint necessitated by the MCAC/UIAC stonewalling via lack of response.
4. Order (or otherwise demand) that, independently and without assistance, each lawyer (including judges and justices) involved in the October 9, 2017 denial of the James Edward White Michigan Unemployment Insurance claim C4781329-0, and all of its subsequent ALJ, MCAC/UIAC, and court interactions, write up and submit their reasoning for why either the MCL 421.48(2) second sentence should be ignored entirely or what exactly it means as applied to the claim.
5. Order proper review of the attorneys and judges perverting or ignoring the words of the U.S. and Michigan constitutions and Michigan laws and including a demand for significant and appropriate disciplinary action by the appropriate organizations.

²⁸ <https://usareset.net/forum/download/file.php?id=4> pages 51 (-157), 59 and 128

²⁹ https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/22/22-387/254109/20230206153942694_20230206-153522-00004142-00000007.pdf#page=14 to 15 ("One part of a statute...")

³⁰ <https://usareset.net/forum/download/file.php?id=29> page 28 or as a single page on Bluesky see <https://bsky.app/profile/jim-at-usareset.bsky.social/post/3lj6d5vmpkk2j>

³¹ <https://usareset.net/forum/download/file.php?id=29> page 12

³² <https://usareset.net/forum/download/file.php?id=29> page 18

³³ <https://usareset.net/forum/download/file.php?id=29> page 19

6. \$6,000,000 in combined damages and punitive damages for the frustration, psychological distress, turmoil, etc., resulting from the long delay and tremendous effort required to get a couple of simple arithmetic errors corrected as well as to attempt to overcome MSU's cheating on their legally required Michigan unemployment insurance obligations.
7. Establishment and funding for a commission to review MSU unemployment and vacation payout records back six years from Petitioner's August 31, 2017 layoff through the current date at the commission's completion of business with MSU obligated to make good faith effort to correct all errors found.
8. Order MSU to immediately cease attempts to get the UIA to treat vacation payouts on layoff as wages or remuneration appropriate for reducing unemployment insurance benefits.
9. \$20,000,000,000 in funding to establish a permanent Institute to examine all court cases in Michigan and cases involving Michigan before United States courts to ensure that abuse of power (like that seen in Petitioner's cases) is stamped out by demanding State of Michigan correction of all such errors/abuses and following through with sanctions on all attorney's, judges, and justices involved in such since the current court appeal and state bar processes are failing.
10. A mandate (or law?) that the intended Michigan Constitution of 1963 Michigan Supreme Court "reasons for each denial of leave to appeal" adheres to the Michigan Constitution's intended mandate³⁴ that such reasons be specific to the case being denied and that "we are not persuaded" and such like generalities be forbidden.
11. Any other redress to which James E. White is entitled.

IN THE ALTERNATIVE REDRESS

1. The Governor, appropriate Executive branch employees, and appropriate Legislators independently provide write ups of precisely why the October 9, 2017 denial of the James Edward White Michigan Unemployment Insurance claim C4781329-0 was correct. Additionally they each indicate precisely why the State of Michigan need not be held to adhering to the interpretation of law requirements as stated in the *Appeals & Opinions Benchbook - Second*

³⁴ Michigan Constitution of 1963 Article VI § 6: Decisions and dissents; writing, contents. Sec. 6. Decisions of the supreme court, including all decisions on prerogative writs, shall be in writing and shall contain a concise statement of the facts and reasons for each decision ***and reasons for each denial of leave to appeal***. When a judge dissents in whole or in part he shall give in writing the reasons for his dissent.

Compare with:

Michigan Constitution 1908 Article VII Sec. 7: Decisions of the supreme court, including all cases of mandamus, quo warranto and certiorari, shall be in writing, with a concise statement of the facts and reasons for the decisions; and shall be signed by the justices concurring therein. Any justice dissenting from a decision shall give the reasons for such dissent in writing under his signature. All such opinions shall be filed in the office of the clerk of the supreme court.

*Edition*³⁵.

2. The Governor, appropriate Executive branch employees, and appropriate Legislators provide write ups, showing all arithmetic, of precisely how a Michigan State University payment of \$2,604.26 on September 29, 2017 for 102 hours of vacation time earned by James Edward White is correct. Additionally they indicate precisely why the State of Michigan need not be held to correct arithmetic.
3. The Governor, appropriate Executive branch employees, and appropriate Legislators provide write ups of precisely why logic and the laws of Michigan allow the State of Michigan (via its UIA and other units) to stonewall by not responding to appeals to the UIAC and then escape Costs compensation to a party who has had to resort to a Superintending Control Complaint to get action. Additionally they indicate precisely why the State of Michigan need not be held to valid logic.
4. The Governor, appropriate Executive branch employees, and appropriate Legislators provide write ups of precisely why the Michigan Supreme Court is permitted to use generic “we are not persuaded” language and otherwise not be an error correcting court in light of the clear changes in Michigan Supreme Court obligations in the Constitution of Michigan of 1963 from the 1908 Michigan Constitution and citizen expectations in general regarding courts that were brought into the United States of America from British practice via U.S. Constitution Amendment IX or how precisely U.S. Constitution Amendment X or Michigan law permits bypass of those expectations.
5. \$6,000,000 combined damages and punitive damages for the frustration, psychological distress, turmoil, etc., resulting from the abject failure of the State of Michigan to make very clear at the earliest opportunity in one or more of the processes involved in the cases referenced above what is now disclosed in the above Alternative Redress actions.
6. Additionally, items 9 to 11 of the preceding Redress Requested section above.

Please be aware that Petitioner reserves the right to debate any and all write-ups provided regarding redress items above for the simple reason that it has become obvious to Petitioner over this long course of fighting for his (and many other employees and citizens) rights that lawyers, judges, and justices have become aware that abuses of power are extremely unlikely to be punished (or even noted) in any way therefore they freely engage in abuse of power.

A complete list of all the claim and case numbers and the related attorneys (including judges and justices) can be provided on request or will hopefully become available as an attachment soon in relation to the posting of this petition on <https://usareset.net/forum/index.php>, Courts and Cases, My Case, My Case(s), and

³⁵ <https://www.courts.michigan.gov/49a01f/siteassets/publications/benchbooks/appeals-opinions/appeals-opinions.pdf>

Re: My Case(s) Petition to Michigan toward the bottom³⁶. Attorneys ignored the meaning of plain English words of the law (such as the second sentence of MCL 421.48(2)), correct arithmetic, and valid logic.

Sincerely,

James E. White
4107 Breakwater Dr
Okemos, MI 48864
(517) 381-1960
james-e-white@idearights.com

³⁶ <https://usareset.net/forum/viewtopic.php?p=258#p258>