

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,

UNPUBLISHED

July 19, 1996

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v

No. 182595

LC No. 93-002433

ARLANDER BUNN, a/k/a ORLANDER BUNN,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

Before: Wahls, P.J., and Murphy and C.D. Corwin,\* JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Following a jury trial, defendant was convicted of nine counts of armed robbery, MCL 750.529; MSA 28.797. Subsequently he pleaded guilty to habitual offender, third offense, MCL 769.11; MSA 28.1083. Defendant was sentenced to concurrent 80- to 120-month terms for his robbery convictions. These sentences were vacated, and defendant was sentenced to twenty to forty years' imprisonment for third-felony offender. Defendant appeals as of right. We affirm.

We find that the trial court did not clearly err in denying defendant's motion to suppress his statement because the statement was made after a legal arrest based on probable cause to believe that defendant had committed robbery. *People v Richardson*, 204 Mich App 71, 79; 514 NW2d 503 (1994). Evidence linking defendant to prior robberies was discovered during a search of the car in which he rode. The car was lawfully stopped on the basis of traffic violations and the suspicion that its occupants were engaged in criminal activity. *United States v Cortez*, 449 US 411, 417-418; 101 S Ct 690; 66 L Ed 2d 621 (1981).

We find that the trial court neither abused its discretion nor denied defendant his right of confrontation when it limited his cross-examination of Investigator Vauris by preventing defense counsel from asking the witness whether he believed that he needed to obtain a confession in order for the prosecutor to authorize charges. *People v Adamski*, 198 Mich App 133, 138; 497 NW2d 546 (1993). The trial court permitted extensive questioning with regard to the circumstances surrounding the giving of the statement and the process by which Investigator Vauris referred cases to the prosecutor.

\* Circuit judge, sitting on the Court of Appeals by assignment.

We find that no manifest injustice would result from the failure to review defendant's challenge to the jury instructions because the trial court's instruction that an attorney's questions are not evidence sufficiently protected defendant's rights. *People v Van Dorsten*, 441 Mich 540, 545; 494 NW2d 737 (1993).

Affirmed.

/s/ Myron H. Wahls  
/s/ William B. Murphy  
/s/ Charles D. Corwin