

March 2014

MICHIGAN SUPREME COURT STRIKES DOWN LOCAL REGULATION OF MEDICAL MARIJUANA

- Michael D. Homier and John R. Taylor

Since 2008, when voters approved the Michigan Medical Marihuana Act ("Act"), many municipalities have adopted ordinances regulating the use of medical marijuana within their boundaries. Some ordinances restrict the zoning districts where medical marijuana can be dispensed, while other ordinances prohibit any activity that violates federal law – which includes the use and distribution of marijuana.

Last month, the Michigan Supreme Court struck down the City of Wyoming's medical marijuana ordinance. The City ordinance prohibited any property uses "contrary to federal law, state law or local ordinance." A City resident who had obtained a registry identification card under the Act desired to grow, possess, and use marijuana in his home, for which he would be immune from penalty under the Act but which would violate federal law and thus violate the City's ordinance. He sued the City in circuit court, arguing that the ordinance interfered with his rights under the Act.

The circuit court found that the ordinance was enforceable because the federal Controlled Substances Act ("CSA"), which prohibits even medicinal use of marijuana, "preempts" (trumps) the Act. The Michigan Court of Appeals reversed that decision and held that the Act is not preempted by the CSA because it was possible to comply with both laws simultaneously. Even if using medical marijuana was immune from prosecution under Michigan law, the federal government could still regulate and enforce the federal laws against that same medical marijuana use.

The City appealed. On further appeal, the Michigan Supreme Court agreed with the Court of Appeals and concluded that the CSA does not preempt the Act because it is possible to comply with both laws simultaneously. The Supreme Court found that Section 4(a) of the Act provides state-law immunity for certain uses of marijuana but does not affect the federal criminalization of or punishment for these actions. In fact, the CSA contemplated a role for states in the regulation of marijuana.

The Supreme Court further held that a municipality may not enact an ordinance when that ordinance directly conflicts with the state's statutory scheme. In this case, the City's ordinance directly conflicted with the Act by prohibiting the very conduct that the Act expressly authorizes – growing, possessing, and using medical marijuana. Thus, the Court found in favor of the plaintiff.

For Michigan municipalities, this ruling means that ordinances that regulate the use of marijuana in direct conflict with the Act will be held invalid. Municipalities that enacted ordinances similar to the City of Wyoming's after the enactment of the Act should review their ordinance with legal counsel in light of the Supreme Court's ruling. If you have questions about your municipality's zoning ordinances, do not hesitate to contact your Foster Swift municipal law attorney.



Municipal Law News March 2014

CASE TO WATCH

- Ronald D. Richards

ELECTRICITY EXPANSION PROJECTS CUTTING THROUGH MUNICIPALITIES

A case pending in Michigan Appellate Court involves whether an electric utility may build a new transmission line project through Michigan townships. *Oshtemo Charter Twp v MPSC et al.* This case stems from the Public Service Commission's decision to approve an electric utility's request to build a new transmission line project through a township in Van Buren County and through a township in Kalamazoo County. The proposal involves new transmission lines about seven miles long, on a 220-foot right-of-way, running through the affected townships, and a new transmission substation. The case is pending in the Michigan Court of Appeals. A decision is expected in mid to late 2014. Other municipalities who may see an electricity provider's effort to expand its easements or install new lines or equipment should stay tuned.

WATCH WEBINAR RECORDINGS

Did you miss some of the Foster Swift webinar series for new officials? If so, don't worry. We've got you covered. Each webinar was recorded and is posted on fosterswift.com.

Watch all 6 webinars on-demand. Just follow this link: http://bit.ly/19Pmprn.

AT THE PODIUM

David M. Lick will present "Public-Private Partnerships Practical Applications" at the "Public-Private Partnerships: Does the Taxpayer Win or Lose?" lecture series April 17. The program is hosted by Osher Lifelong Learning Institute at the University of Michigan. Register here: http://bit.ly/1g5hLHr

Anne M. Seurynck will present "Top 10 Open Meetings Act and Freedom of Information Act Mistakes" at the 2014 Loleta Fyan Rural Libraries Conference Wednesday, April 30 through Friday, May 2. For registration information: http://l.usa.gov/ldu6j3l

MUNICIPAL ATTORNEYS

GROUP LEADER

Anne M. Seurynck 616.726.2240 aseurynck@fosterswift.com Michael R. Blum | 248.785.4722 Karl W. Butterer | 616.726.2212 Nichole J. Derks | 616.796.2516 James B. Doezema | 616.726.2205 Laura J. Genovich | 616.726.2238 Brian G. Goodenough | 517.371.8147 Lisa J. Hamameh | 248.539.9906 Richard L. Hillman | 517.371.8129 Michael D. Homier | 616.726.2230 John M. Kamins | 248.785.4727 Thomas R. Meagher | 517.371.8161 Brian J. Renaud | 248.539.9913 Ronald D. Richards | 517.371.8154

LANSING FARMINGTON HILLS

GRAND RAPIDS

DETROIT

HOLLAND

Foster Swift Collins & Smith, PC **Municipal Law News** is intended for our clients and friends. This newsletter highlights specific areas of law. This communication is not legal advice. The reader should consult an attorney to determine how the information applies to any specific situation.

IRS Circular 230 Notice: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS, we inform you that any U.S. tax advice contained in this communication is not intended to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code, or (ii) promoting, marketing, or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed in this communication.

