

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v

MICHAEL DOUGLAS BLACK,

Defendant-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

May 24, 1996

No. 185950

LC Nos. 94-003305-FH,

94-003306-FH

Before: Kavanagh, T.G.,* P.J., and R.B. Burns** and G.S. Allen,** JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Defendant pleaded guilty in two separate cases to breaking and entering an occupied dwelling with intent to commit larceny, MCL 750.110; MSA 28.305, and breaking or entering a motor vehicle with intent to steal property over \$5, MCL 750.356a; MSA 28.588(1). He was sentenced to four years' probation, with the first year to be served in the county jail, and was also ordered to participate in a Special Alternative Incarceration program and substance abuse treatment. He appeals as of right. We affirm. This case has been decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(A).

Although a trial court may not delegate its authority to impose conditions of probation to others, it may delegate the normal supervision of imposed conditions. *People v Peters*, 191 Mich App 159, 165; 477 NW2d 479 (1991). In this case, the trial court did not improperly delegate to others its sentencing authority to set the conditions of probation. Rather, each of the conditions in question, participation in the SAI program and participation in substance abuse treatment, were imposed by the trial court, which merely delegated the supervision of those conditions. Such delegation was not improper. Furthermore, the trial court was authorized by MCL 771.3(2); MSA 28.11.33(2) to impose

*Former Supreme Court Justice, sitting on the Court of Appeals by assignment pursuant to Administrative Order 1995-1.

**Former Court of Appeals Judges, sitting on the Court of Appeals by assignment pursuant to Administrative Order 1995-1.

as a condition of probation *both* incarceration in the county jail for not more than a year *and* participation in substance abuse treatment.

Next, it is clear from the record that defendant received not only a proportionate sentence, *People v Milbourn*, 435 Mich 630; 461 NW2d 1 (1990), but one that was tailored to address his specific needs for structure and discipline, as well as substance abuse treatment. Under the circumstances, a remand for further articulation would not serve any useful purpose. See *People v Brown*, 186 Mich App 350, 358-359; 463 NW2d 491 (1990). See also *People v Kreger*, 214 Mich App 549, 554-555; 543 NW2d 55 (1995).

Affirmed.

/s/ Thomas G. Kavanagh

/s/ Robert B. Burns

/s/ Glenn S. Allen, Jr.