

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

GREAT LAKES SHORES, INC.,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

UNPUBLISHED
May 14, 2015
APPROVED FOR
PUBLICATION
July 2, 2015
9:00 a.m.

v

JENNIFER M. BARTLEY, a/k/a JENNIFER M.
SKORUPA,

No. 320913
Sanilac Circuit Court
LC No. 13-035064-CH

Defendant-Appellee.

Before: HOEKSTRA, P.J., and SAWYER and BORRELLO, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

The trial court granted plaintiff's motion for summary disposition but denied plaintiff's request for attorney fees. Plaintiff appeals as of right. We reverse and remand.

Plaintiff is a non-profit corporation that is "designated to administer the Great Lakes Shore, Inc., Project . . .," which is a summer resort in Worth Township. Plaintiff is organized under the summer resort owners corporation act, MCL 455.201 *et seq.* Lot owners are required to pay yearly dues and assessments, which are used to maintain the resort property and to pay for taxes and insurance. Plaintiff alleges that defendant paid her dues and assessments from 2004 through 2009, but that she thereafter failed to pay. According to plaintiff, the amount of dues and assessments owed was \$400. In December 2012, plaintiff recorded a lien for the unpaid dues and assessments.

Plaintiff thereafter filed suit, asserting one count for "foreclosure of association lien" and one count for "collection of unpaid assessments." Plaintiff also alleged that it was entitled to recover attorney fees pursuant to its bylaws. In her answer to plaintiff's complaint, defendant alleged that she had not received any bills from plaintiff for more than eight years.

Plaintiff subsequently moved for summary disposition. In an attached affidavit, plaintiff's president averred that invoices had been sent to defendant for her dues and assessments. Plaintiff contended that in view of this fact and the fact that defendant had paid her dues and assessments from 2004 through 2009, her allegation that she had not received a bill from plaintiff in more than eight years was not an adequate defense. Plaintiff sought \$400 in

Defendant argued below that attorney fees are only recoverable if plaintiff foreclosed its lien. However, the above provision clearly contemplates permitting both a lien and a separate action to collect delinquent dues. The provision identifies a lien and an action to collect unpaid dues as separate and distinct avenues of relief for plaintiff. Therefore, because the bylaws, a contract between plaintiff and defendant, permitted plaintiff to seek attorney fees that it incurred to recover unpaid dues and assessments, the trial court should have awarded such fees.

Finally, plaintiff also argues that the trial court erred by failing to award \$40 in late fees. The bylaws provide for a \$10 late fee if a member's dues are not paid on time. Because defendant failed to pay her dues for four years, \$40 in late fees were appropriate.

Following the hearing on plaintiff's motion for summary disposition, plaintiff filed a proposed order under the seven-day rule. MCR 2.602(B)(3). Plaintiff's proposed order did not contain an award for \$40 in late fees. Defendant did not object to the proposed order, and the trial court adopted plaintiff's proposed order apparently without alteration. Accordingly, the failure to account for the late fees is attributable to plaintiff. Nevertheless, because reversal is required to address attorney fees, we direct the trial court to correct this as well on remand.

Reversed and remanded for further proceedings consistent with this opinion. We do not retain jurisdiction. Plaintiff may tax costs.

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra
/s/ David H. Sawyer
/s/ Stephen L. Borrello