STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF APPEALS

WILLIE JAMES GREEN and JACKIE L. GREEN,

Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v

R. J. REYNOLDS TOBACCO CO. and DONALD F. KNOLL,

Defendants-Appellees.

UNPUBLISHED
May 26, 1998

No. 196355
Wayne Circuit Court
LC No. 96-600111 NZ

Before: Hood, P.J., and MacKenzie and Doctoroff, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Plaintiffs appeal by leave granted from an order denying their motion for reconsideration of a prior order changing venue in this employment discrimination case. We affirm.

Plaintiffs first argue that the trial court erred in denying their motion for reconsideration because its previous order granting a change of venue to Oakland Circuit Court was incorrect. This Court reviews a trial court's decision to deny a motion for reconsideration for an abuse of discretion. *In re Beglinger Trust*, 221 Mich App 273, 279; 561 NW2d 130 (1997). We review a trial court's decision to grant or deny a motion for a change of venue for clear error. *Vermilya v Carter Crompton Site Development Contractors, Inc,* 201 Mich App 467, 471; 506 NW2d 580 (1993).

The venue provision of the Civil Rights Act, MCL 37.2801(2); MSA 3.548(801)(2), states that an action "may be brought in the circuit court for the county where the alleged violation occurred, or for the county where the person against whom the civil complaint is filed resides or has his principal place of business." In this case, we are satisfied that any adverse employment decisions by defendants regarding plaintiff Willie James Green were made at defendant R.J. Reynolds' regional office in Oakland County or at its headquarters in North Carolina. Although Green works in both Wayne and Oakland Counties, he has failed to establish that any of the alleged discriminatory decisions were made in Wayne County. In fact, plaintiffs, at best, have only shown that the alleged effects of defendants' discriminatory actions were felt in Wayne County. This Court, however, has stated that the location where a party's

discriminatory actions are felt is not sufficient to establish venue under the civil rights laws. *Barnes v Int'l Business Machines Corp*, 212 Mich App 223, 226; 537 NW2d 265 (1995).

Plaintiffs also argue that the trial court erred in declining to hear their motion for reconsideration on the ground that it no longer had jurisdiction over the matter. We disagree. We review questions of law de novo. *Markillie v Bd of Co Road Comm'rs of Co of Livingston*, 210 Mich App 16, 21; 532 NW2d 878 (1995). Once a trial court orders a change of venue, the court is without power to hear any further matters in the case since jurisdiction is vested in the transferee court. *Saba v Gray*, 111 Mich App 304, 311-312; 314 NW2d 597 (1981); *Sugar, Schwartz, Silver, Schwartz & Tyler v Thomas*, 25 Mich App 41, 44; 181 NW2d 59 (1970). Because the trial court in this case granted a change in venue effective immediately, it did not err in declining to hear plaintiffs' motion for reconsideration on the basis that it lacked jurisdiction to do so. See *Saba*, *supra*, p 312.

Affirmed.

/s/ Harold Hood
/s/ Barbara B. MacKenzie
/s/ Martin M. Doctoroff