

Judgment fee Paid \$25.00

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE COUNTY OF WASHTENAW

SALLY VINTER, LESLIE KISH, ASHO CRAINE,  
SUE KIEREN, EUGENE WHITE, MICHAEL  
SCHECTMAN, and The ANN ARBOR LEAGUE OF  
WOMEN VOTERS, on behalf of themselves  
and all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

vs

File No. 74-8553-AW

THE CITY OF ANN ARBOR, a Municipal  
corporation, and THE ANN ARBOR  
TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY, a  
corporate governmental entity  
established pursuant to statute to  
acquire and operate a mass transporta-  
tion system for and on behalf of the  
public in the City of Ann Arbor and  
environs,

Defendants.

FILED  
OCT 9 1 35 PM '75  
ROBERT M. HARRISON  
COUNTY CLERK

Maxine Boord Virtue (P 21845)  
Arthur E. Carpenter (P 11635)  
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

R. Bruce Laidlaw (P 16346)  
Lawrence W. Sperling (P 20832)  
Attorneys for Defendants

JUDGMENT

At a session of said Court held in the  
Washtenaw County Building, Ann Arbor,  
Michigan on the 7th day of October, 1975.

PRESENT: HON. PATRICK J. CONLIN  
Circuit Judge

This matter has been brought by disinterested citizens  
and organizations in the form of a taxpayers' suit on behalf of  
named Plaintiffs and all others similarly situated. The action  
involves the right of the defendant City to withhold certain tax  
revenues collected for the purposes of the defendant Authority.  
The defendant Authority is an independent agency created by the  
City to operate public transportation. In 1973 the voters approved

C. C. JRL. MICROFILMED  
333A  
RL No. 90330  
Page No. 8553

an annual 2.5 mill tax for public transportation. Many of the plaintiffs contributed of their time, energy and resources to the success of that election.

This Court recognized the status of the plaintiffs as citizens seeking to protect the common weal and granted them a partial summary judgment on January 29, 1975 finding that the defendant City owed the defendant Authority the sum of \$138,048.59 and interest from August 1, 1973. The opinions of the Court on this issue dated January 10, 1975 and July 2, 1975 are incorporated herein by reference.

The plaintiffs claim to have discovered, through depositions and further rummaging in the defendant's files that the defendant City owes another \$45,757 to the defendant NATA and a motion for summary judgment for the recovery of that sum is before the Court.

The parties hereto, believing, however, that it is in the public interest to end this litigation now, have expressed their desire to settle this cause as evidenced by their approval of the form of this judgment.

This matter particularly affects the public interest and the Court views its role on settlement as analogous to that governing class actions under GCR 208. It has, accordingly, examined the remaining issues before the Court and considered the benefits to the public of further litigation and affirmatively finds this settlement to be in the public interest. The legal principles established by the partial summary judgment would not be significantly expanded by further litigation and all parties would be burdened by additional attorney fees.