

COA Order: May 2, 2011

[3. May 2011 By Julie Lam](#)

In *VanDussen v Court of Appeals*, the Michigan Supreme Court directed the Court of Appeals to “articulate the reason why ‘the fair administration of justice’ warrants the denial of plaintiff’s request to film oral argument on May 10, 2011” in *People v Anderson*, COA No. 300641, a medical marijuana case. On remand, the Court of Appeals clarified that it had originally denied plaintiff’s request because based on the minimal material submitted it had concluded that plaintiff was neither the “media” nor a “media agency” pursuant to Administrative Order 1989-1(1)(b). However, since the issuance of the remand order, plaintiff submitted material showing that he is a free-lance journalist whose work appears in general news publications and mainstream electronic media outlets, and, as a result, the Court of Appeals concluded that he did meet the definition of “media” and granted his request to record oral argument.