

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v

CHARLES J. AYERS,

Defendant-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

February 14, 1997

No. 180302

Oakland Circuit Court

LC No. 94-134554 FH

Before: O’Connell, P.J., and Markman and M.J. Talbot,* JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Defendant pleaded guilty to felonious assault, MCL 750.82; MSA 28.277, and, pursuant to a Cobbs¹ agreement, was sentenced to serve a two year probationary term with the first sixty days to be served in the county jail. He now appeals as of right, contending that the trial court abused its discretion in refusing to allow him to withdraw his plea. We affirm.

Defendant first argues that his plea was involuntarily tendered. In *People v Valle*, 364 Mich 471, 477; 110 NW2d 673 (1961), our Supreme Court explained that a plea of guilty may not be considered to have been tendered voluntarily where it was “induced by fear, misapprehension, persuasion, promises, inadvertence or ignorance.” Here, defendant contends that he was coerced to plead guilty because the complainant, his girlfriend, would have been subject to prosecution had she recanted her testimony. While it appears to be true that the complainant would have been subject to prosecution, this does not suggest that defendant’s plea was involuntarily given. Therefore, we find no abuse of discretion. *People v Effinger*, 212 Mich App 67, 69; 536 NW2d 809 (1995).

Defendant also submits that there was an insufficient factual basis to support his conviction. A sufficient factual basis may exist even if the defendant denies an element of the crime, so long as an inculpatory inference may be drawn from the facts to which the defendant does admit. *People v Haack*, 396 Mich 367, 374-375; 240 NW2d 704 (1976). Our review of the record indicates that defendant’s admission were more than sufficient to support all the elements of felonious assault. See MCL 750.82; MSA 28.277. Here, the court asked defendant “at a bare minimum you willfully threatened her with the

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

screwdriver?” Defendant responded, “Yes, I did.” Again, we find no abuse of discretion. *Effinger*, *supra*.

Defendant adverts to several other arguments throughout the body of his brief. However, because these arguments are not developed and are not mentioned in the statement of questions presented, we decline to address them. See *People v Yarbrough*, 183 Mich App 163, 165; 454 NW2d 419 (1990).

Affirmed.

/s/ Peter D. O’Connell
/s/ Stephen J. Markman
/s/ Michael J. Talbot

¹ *People v Cobbs*, 443 Mich 276; 505 NW2d 208 (1993).