

**In the Supreme Court of the United States**

---

KARI BEEMAN, LINDA HUGHES, STEPHANIE HULKA-  
BERTOIA, SHEDRICK MI, LLC, AND JOHNNY DORE,  
AS PERSONAL REPRESENTATIVE OF THE  
ESTATE OF JOHNNY CHAPMAN,

*Petitioners,*

*v.*

MUSKEGON COUNTY TREASURER,

*Respondent.*

---

*On Petition For A Writ Of Certiorari  
To The Michigan Court Of Appeals*

---

**PETITION FOR REHEARING**

---

DEBORAH J. LA FETRA  
Pacific Legal Foundation  
3100 Clarendon Blvd.  
Suite 1000  
Arlington, VA 22201

CHRISTINA M. MARTIN  
*Counsel of Record*  
Pacific Legal Foundation  
4440 PGA Blvd., Suite 307  
Palm Beach Gardens, FL  
33410  
Telephone: (916) 330-4059  
CMartin@pacificlegal.org

*Counsel for Petitioners*

---

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Petition for Rehearing .....	1
Reasons for Granting Rehearing.....	1
Conclusion .....	4
Certificate of Counsel .....	5

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Army Corps of Eng'rs v. Hawkes Co.</i> , 578 U.S. 590 (2016) .....	3
<i>Beeman v. Muskegon County Treasurer</i> , No. 24-858 (U.S.) .....	1-2
<i>Espinosa v. Florida</i> , 505 U.S. 1079 (1992) .....	3
<i>FCC v. Consumers' Rsch.</i> , 606 U.S. 656 (2025) .....	3
<i>Florida v. Rodriguez</i> , 461 U.S. 940 (1983) .....	4
<i>Florida v. Royer</i> , 460 U.S. 491 (1983) .....	4
<i>Hitchcock v. Florida</i> , 505 U.S. 1215 (1992) .....	3
<i>Holland v. Florida</i> , 560 U.S. 631 (2010) .....	3
<i>Kent Recycling Servs., LLC v.</i> <i>Army Corps of Eng'rs</i> , 578 U.S. 1019 (2016) .....	3
<i>Lawrence v. Chater</i> , 516 U.S. 163 (1996) .....	3
<i>Liberty Univ. v. Geithner</i> , 568 U.S. 1022 (2012) .....	3
<i>Melson v. Allen</i> , 561 U.S. 1001 (2010) .....	3
<i>Nat'l Fed'n of Indep. Bus. v. Sebelius</i> , 567 U.S. 519 (2012) .....	3
<i>Nelson v. City of New York</i> , 352 U.S. 103 (1956) .....	1-2, 4

<i>Oklahoma v. United States</i> , 145 S. Ct. 2836 (2025) .....	3
<i>Pung v. Isabella County</i> , No. 25-95 (U.S.) .....	1-4
<i>Soto v. United States</i> , 543 U.S. 1117 (2005) .....	3
<i>United States v. Booker</i> , 543 U.S. 220 (2005) .....	3
<b>Statutes</b>	
Mich. Comp. Laws § 211.78t .....	2
<b>Other Authorities</b>	
Rule 44.2 .....	1

## PETITION FOR REHEARING

Petitioners Kari Beeman, et al., respectfully petition under Rule 44.2 for rehearing of the Court’s January 12, 2025, order denying their Petition for a Writ of Certiorari. *Beeman v. Muskegon County Treasurer*, No. 24-858. Intervening circumstances in a merits case being heard by this Court that post-date the Petition’s distribution merit rehearing. In *Pung v. Isabella County*, No. 25-95 (petition granted Oct. 3, 2025), the Court is considering whether the Takings Clause requires more than an auction’s surplus proceeds where a Michigan County confiscated a home as payment for a small tax debt. Although the questions presented differ from this case, the Respondent—whose brief was filed the same day this Court denied Beeman’s Petition—relies in part on the same Supreme Court decision at the heart of Beeman’s Petition: *Nelson v. City of New York*, 352 U.S. 103, 110 (1956) (the availability of a procedure prior to foreclosure to recover surplus proceeds remaining from a future tax sale allows the government to confiscate the proceeds otherwise due as just compensation if owners fail to navigate the procedure). Because that reliance brings *Nelson* to the forefront of the dispute in *Pung*, this Court should either grant rehearing or hold this motion and Beeman’s Petition pending the decision in *Pung*.

## REASONS FOR GRANTING REHEARING

1. Beeman’s Petition for Writ of Certiorari poses the question of whether the takings language in *Nelson* is binding, and if so, whether it should be overturned. Beeman’s case arises from the County confiscating all of the surplus proceeds from the sale of Petitioners’ property because they each failed to

serve a special notice-of-claim form prior to the statutory deadline, which ran more than a month before the auction, long before the government took physical possession of the real estate, and approximately one year before she would have been able to collect any money from the sale had she filed the form on time. Mich. Comp. Laws § 211.78t. The lower court upheld the draconian, Kafkaesque claim procedure against takings and due process claims raised by the Petitioners based on this Court's decision in *Nelson*, 352 U.S. 103.

2. This Court agreed to hear *Pung v. Isabella County* months after briefing was completed in *Beeman* on June 2, 2025. It was not apparent from the questions presented in the *Pung* Petition that *Nelson* would have any bearing on the issues presented in *Pung*.

This Court considered the *Beeman* Petition at the Conference on January 9, 2025. Three days later, on January 12, 2025, the Brief of Respondent Isabella County was filed in *Pung*. In that brief, the County relies upon takings language in *Nelson* to argue that the Court should rule that it needs only to pay surplus proceeds to satisfy the Takings Clause in that case. Respondent's Brief at 22, *Pung*, No. 25-95. Thus, in *Pung*, this Court may decide whether *Nelson* is binding or *dicta* and whether its assumptions about the Takings Clause, which were arrived at with almost no briefing on the issue, are consistent with modern takings jurisprudence. Those questions relate directly to the Petition here, which expressly asks whether *Nelson*'s takings language is binding, and if so, whether it should be overturned. If *Pung* holds that *Nelson*'s language is non-binding or incorrect in any way, that decision would undermine the core

rationale for the lower court’s ruling against Beeman’s takings claim. See Appendix at 20a-21a (“Following the reasoning of the *Nelson* Court, respondents did not suffer a compensable taking.”). If that occurs, it would be appropriate for the Court to grant, vacate, and remand (GVR) the lower court’s decision in this case for reconsideration in light of *Pung*. See *Lawrence v. Chater*, 516 U.S. 163, 167 (1996) (per curiam) (noting that a GVR may be proper when an intervening decision yields “a reasonable probability that the decision below rests upon a premise that the lower court would reject if given the opportunity for further consideration”); see also *id.* at 180 (Scalia, J., dissenting) (“This is undoubtedly the largest category of ‘GVRs’ that now exists.”).

In these circumstances, petitions for certiorari “regularly” are held to allow for the possibility of a GVR, *id.* at 181 (Scalia, J., dissenting), and petitions for rehearing have been granted to facilitate such GVRs. See, e.g., *Oklahoma v. United States*, 145 S. Ct. 2836 (2025) (rehearing granted and GVR in light of *FCC v. Consumers’ Rsch.*, 606 U.S. 656 (2025)); *Kent Recycling Servs., LLC v. Army Corps of Eng’rs*, 578 U.S. 1019 (2016) (rehearing granted and GVR in light of *Army Corps of Eng’rs v. Hawkes Co.*, 578 U.S. 590 (2016)); *Liberty Univ. v. Geithner*, 568 U.S. 1022 (2012) (rehearing granted and GVR in light of *Nat’l Fed’n of Indep. Bus. v. Sebelius*, 567 U.S. 519 (2012)); *Melson v. Allen*, 561 U.S. 1001 (2010) (granting rehearing and GVR in light of *Holland v. Florida*, 560 U.S. 631 (2010)); *Soto v. United States*, 543 U.S. 1117 (2005) (granting rehearing and GVR in light of *United States v. Booker*, 543 U.S. 220 (2005)); *Hitchcock v. Florida*, 505 U.S. 1215 (1992) (granting rehearing and GVR in light of *Espinosa v. Florida*, 505 U.S. 1079

(1992)); *Florida v. Rodriguez*, 461 U.S. 940 (1983) (granting rehearing and GVR in light of *Florida v. Royer*, 460 U.S. 491 (1983)).

This petition for rehearing should thus be granted or held pending a decision in *Pung*. If the decision in *Pung* implicates *Nelson* or otherwise implicates the lower court's decision on the Takings Clause here, then the Court should grant Beeman et al.'s Petition for Writ of Certiorari.

### CONCLUSION

The petition for rehearing should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTINA M. MARTIN

*Counsel of Record*

DEBORAH J. LA FETRA

Pacific Legal Foundation

3100 Clarendon Blvd.

Ste. 1000

Arlington, VA 22201

Telephone: (561) 691-5000

CMartin@pacificlegal.org

*Counsel for Petitioners*

FEBRUARY 2026



**CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL**

I hereby certify that this petition for rehearing is presented in good faith and not for delay, and that it is restricted to the grounds specified in Supreme Court Rule 44.2.

/s/ Christina M. Martin  
CHRISTINA M. MARTIN  
*Counsel of Record*