

Exhibit A: Chart of Claims

CHART OF DISTRICT COURT'S DECISIONS BY CLAIM

Counts	District Court's Ruling	Appeal
<p>Count I</p> <p>Ex post facto challenge to SORA 2021.</p>	<p>Summary Judgment for Plaintiffs</p> <p>Permanent injunction barring retroactive application of SORA to pre-2011 registrants. Sixth Circuit stayed relief.</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Defendants</p>
<p>Count II</p> <p>Ex post facto and due process challenge to retroactive extension of registration terms from 25 years to life.</p>	<p>Summary Judgment for Plaintiffs on Ex Post Facto Grounds; Due Process Claim Not Decided</p> <p>Permanent injunction barring retroactive application of SORA to pre-2011 registrants. Sixth Circuit stayed relief.</p> <p>Because the court granted relief on ex post facto grounds, it did not decide the due process claim (which Plaintiffs preserve).</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Defendants</p>
<p>Count III</p> <p>Equal protection and due process challenge to automatic lengthy and lifetime registration without individual review or an opportunity for removal.</p>	<p>Summary Judgment for Defendants</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Plaintiffs</p>
<p>Count IV</p> <p>Equal protection challenge to denial of opportunity to petition for removal from registry for people similarly situated to petition-eligible registrants.</p>	<p>Summary Judgment for Defendants</p>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Plaintiffs</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Count V</p> <p>First Amendment claim that mandatory reporting under SORA is compelled speech.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Summary Judgment for Defendants</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">No</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Count VI</p> <p>Due process challenge to extension of registration terms as violation of plea agreements.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Not Decided</p> <p>The court found the issue moot because Count II (retroactive extension) grants full relief. (Plaintiffs preserve this claim.)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">No</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Count VII</p> <p>Due process and equal protection challenge to registration of people with convictions that lack a sexual element absent a judicial finding that the offense was sexual in nature.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Summary Judgment for Plaintiffs on Due Process Grounds; Equal Protection Claim Not Decided</p> <p>Permanent injunction removing such people from the registry and barring their registration absent a judicial finding that the offense was sexual in nature.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">No</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Count VIII</p> <p>Vagueness claim challenging parts of SORA 2021</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Adoption of Certain Clarifying Constructions Agreed to by the Parties; Partial Summary Judgment for Plaintiffs and for Defendants</p> <p>The parties agreed as to some challenged terms and the district court ruled on the rest. Both sides won and lost some of the vagueness challenges.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Yes (for 3 provisions)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiffs</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">Count IX</p> <p>First Amendment challenge to compelled admission of “understanding” the registration duties imposed by SORA.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Summary Judgment for Plaintiffs</p> <p>Permanent injunction barring Defendants from requiring registrants to attest that they “understand” their registration duties.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">No</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Count X</p> <p>First Amendment challenge to duty to report email addresses and internet identifiers.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Summary Judgment for Plaintiffs</p> <p>Permanent injunction barring the reporting and database storage of such information.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">No</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Count XI</p> <p>Due process, equal protection, and privileges and immunities claim for people with non-Michigan convictions challenging how their registration and tier levels are assigned, and challenging the imposition of harsher and longer registration requirements than for people with Michigan convictions.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Summary Judgment for Plaintiffs on Due Process and Equal Protection Claims; No Decision on Challenge Under Privileges & Immunities Clause</p> <p>Permanent injunction barring registration of the non-Michigan subclass absent a judicial determination that their conviction is “substantially similar” to a Michigan conviction, and barring worse treatment based on non-Michigan convictions. Sixth Circuit stayed relief.</p> <p>Because the district court granted relief on other grounds, it did not decide the privileges and immunities claim (which Plaintiffs preserve).</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendants</p>