

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
INGHAM COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT

JLLJ DEVELOPMENT, LLC, A MICHIGAN  
LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY, AND  
LANSING FUTURE DEVELOPMENT II, LLC,  
A MICHIGAN LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY,

PLAINTIFFS,

vs.

Case No. 21-189-CB  
Hon. Joyce Draganchuk

KEWADIN CASINOS GAMING AUTHORITY,  
A DULY AUTHORIZED ENTITY CREATED  
UNDER THE LAWS OF THE SAULT STE.  
MARIE TRIBE OF CHIPPEWA INDIANS,

DEFENDANT.

---

Andrew J. Broder (P23051) Payne,  
Broder & Fossee, P.C.  
Attorney for Plaintiffs  
32100 Telegraph Road, Suite 200  
Bingham Farms, MI 48025  
(248) 642-7733  
abroder@ppbf.com

Dennis McShane (P72028)  
Attorney for Defendant  
Sault Ste. Marie Tribe of Chippewa Indians  
523 Ashmun Street  
Sault Ste. Marie, MI 49783  
(906) 635-6050 ext. 26305  
[DMcShane@saulttribe.net](mailto:DMcShane@saulttribe.net)

Michael H. Perry (P22890)  
Fraser Trebilcock Davis & Dunlap, P.C.  
Co-Counsel for Plaintiffs  
124 West Allegan Street, Suite 1000  
Lansing, MI 48933 (517) 482-  
5800  
mperry@fraserlawfirm.com

Jeffrey R. Rasmussen  
Attorney for Defendant  
Patterson Earnhart Real Bird & Wilson  
1900 Plaza Drive  
Louisville, CO 80027 (303)  
926-5292  
jrasmussen@nativelawgroup.com

---

**EX-PARTE TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND  
ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE**

At a session of said Court, held in  
the City of Lansing, County of Ingham,  
State of Michigan, on January 19, 2023

PRESENT: Hon. Joyce Draganchuk  
Circuit Court Judge

The Court has considered the motion, brief and supporting affidavit filed by Plaintiffs, JLLJ Development, LLC and Lansing Future Development II, LLC, in accordance with MCR 3.310, by which Plaintiffs seek entry of a Temporary Restraining Order and issuance of an Order to Show Cause Why a Preliminary Injunction should not issue against Defendant. The Court finds that good cause has been shown to grant a restraining order for the following reasons:

1. Plaintiffs have shown a likelihood of success on the merits of its claims.
2. Plaintiffs will suffer irreparable harm and loss if Defendant is permitted to conceal or dissipate its assets in an attempt wrongfully to evade post-judgment enforcement proceedings by Plaintiffs and to use funds that should be properly be applied against the anticipated significant judgment to be entered shortly in this matter.
3. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law.
4. Plaintiffs will suffer significant injury in the event of the denial of temporary injunctive relief; in contrast, the injury to Defendant by issuance of an injunction (which will simply maintain the *status quo*) is minimal. The granting of a temporary restraining order will further the public interest by requiring the Defendant to act in a fashion in accordance with applicable law and to maintain the *status quo* pending entry of a final judgment, expiration of the 21-day period to file an appeal, and the posting of a bond by Defendant or the payment by Defendant of the full amount due under the judgment.
5. Notice to Defendant is not required because such notice may precipitate further improper concealment of Defendant's assets to obstruct the enforcement of a potentially significant judgment amount based on the findings of Fact and Conclusions

of Law issued by the Court on January 3, 2022, and because an injunction will merely maintain the *status quo* and require the Defendant to act in accordance with the law.

In light of the above, the Court grants Plaintiffs' motion and enters this Order, as follows:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant, and those acting in concert with Defendant, are hereby enjoined and restrained from concealing, dissipating, transferring, spending, distributing, lending or in any way disposing of any corporate assets during the pendency of this cause or in any way disposing of the proceeds or any funds into which the proceeds or their equivalent can be traced to such assets except in the usual and ordinary course of business of Defendant's casino business and for fair and adequate consideration. This injunction extends to Defendant and its officers, agents, representatives, employees, and instrumentalities, as well as any other persons who receive notice of this Order.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that no bond shall be required since the Defendant will suffer no harm as a result of the issuance of this injunctive order since it merely maintains the *status quo*, requires the Defendant to act in accordance with the law, and prevents the wrongful misuse or dissipation of Defendant's assets that should be available to pay any judgment entered in this action against the Defendant and in favor of Plaintiffs, and requires the Defendant to act in accordance with the law.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Defendant shall appear before this Court on February 1, 2023, at 2:45pm via zoom, or as soon thereafter as counsel can be heard, to show cause, if any, why a preliminary injunction should not be issued by the Court, adopting the terms and conditions of the temporary restraining order, during the pendency of this cause.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that a copy of this Order, together with this motion filed in this matter, shall be served upon Defendant or its authorized agent at least 7 days prior to the date stated above for the show cause hearing.

ISSUED this 19<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2023, at 10:40am This Ex Parte Restraining Order expires on the later of 14 days from the date of issuance of this Order, or upon the conclusion of the show cause hearing described above.

*James S. James P36650*  
FOR Joyce Draganchuk  
Circuit Judge