

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

SAFIYA A. KHALID,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v

SALEEM KHALID,

Defendant-Appellee.

UNPUBLISHED

April 23, 2002

No. 227729

Wayne Circuit Court

LC No. 00-013973-TP

Before: Cooper, P.J. and Hood and Murray, JJ.

MEMORANDUM

After several years of ongoing litigation, the Washtenaw Circuit Court granted plaintiff's motion to transfer this domestic relations case to the Wayne Circuit Court pursuant to MCR 3.212. The Wayne Circuit Court held that the transfer was not authorized under MCR 3.212(B)(1)(d) because Wayne and Washtenaw counties are contiguous, and directed the Wayne County Clerk to return the case file to the Washtenaw County Clerk. Plaintiff appeals this order as of right. We affirm.

The Wayne Circuit Court concluded that, because MCR 3.212(B)(1)(d) was not satisfied, it "cannot exercise jurisdiction." We review de novo jurisdictional issues and issues involving the interpretation of court rules. *Universal Am-Can Ltd v Attorney General*, 197 Mich App 34, 37; 494 NW2d 787 (1992); *St George Greek Orthodox Church of Southgate, Michigan v Laupmanis Associates, PC*, 204 Mich App 278, 282; 514 NW2d 516 (1994).

It is clear that the Wayne Circuit Court has subject-matter jurisdiction over paternity actions and custody disputes, MCL 722.714; MCL 722.720(1); *Altman v Nelson*, 197 Mich App 467, 473-474; 495 NW2d 826 (1992); see also *Bowie v Arder*, 441 Mich 23, 39; 490 NW2d 568 (1992), quoting *Joy v Two-Bit Corp*, 287 Mich 244, 253-254; 283 NW 45 (1938), and none of the parties here challenged the Wayne Circuit Court's exercise of personal jurisdiction over them. Also, venue does not implicate jurisdiction in actions under the Paternity Act. *Morrison v Richerson*, 198 Mich App 202, 207; 497 NW2d 506 (1992). For these reasons, the trial court erred insofar that it characterized the perceived violation of MCR 3.212 as a jurisdictional defect.

Although the Wayne Circuit Court's conclusion concerning jurisdiction was mistaken, it was nonetheless correct in rejecting the transfer of the case between contiguous counties.

MCR 3.212 is a specific provision allowing a change of venue in a postjudgment domestic relations case. MCR 3.212(A)(1). Because the requirements of the rule were not met, venue was not properly laid in Wayne County. Accordingly, the Wayne Circuit Court properly exercised its authority to reject the transfer. See *Eigner v Eigner*, 79 Mich App 189; 261 NW2d 254 (1977). This Court will not reverse a trial court's order if it reached the right result for the wrong reason. *Phinney v Perlmutter*, 222 Mich App 513, 532; 564 NW2d 532 (1997).

The remaining issues raised by plaintiff are not properly before us at this time and we decline to address them.

Affirmed.

/s/ Jessica R. Cooper

/s/ Harold Hood

/s/ Kirsten Frank Kelly