STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF APPEALS

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,

        Plaintiff-Appellee,

v

DEBORAH C. BEAMON,

        Defendant-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED
September 23, 1997

No. 190612
Oakland Circuit Court
LC No. 94-136637

Before: Michael J. Kelly, P.J., and Wahls, and Gage, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Defendant appeals as of right from her jury trial conviction of second-degree murder, MCL 750.317; MSA 28.549. Defendant was sentenced to twenty to forty years' imprisonment for her second-degree murder conviction. However, the trial court vacated that sentence and sentenced defendant to the same term as a third habitual offender, MCL 769.11; MSA 28.1083. We affirm.

Defendant argues that the trial court abused its discretion in refusing to allow defendant to question potential jurors concerning their attitudes towards self-defense. Generally, a defendant waives her ability to challenge the manner in which voir dire was conducted if she failed to exhaust her preemptory challenges and expressed her satisfaction with the jury at the close of the voir dire examination. *People v Rose,* 268 Mich 529, 531; 256 NW 536 (1934); *People v Hubbard (After Remand),* 217 Mich App 459, 466-467; 552 NW2d 493 (1996).

Here, defendant did not exhaust all of her preemptory challenges. In addition, she expressed her satisfaction with the impaneled jury. Contrast *People v Taylor*, 195 Mich App 57, 60; 489 NW2d 99 (1992) (where the defendant refused to express satisfaction with the jury impaneled and repeatedly reminded the trial court that she felt that the voir dire prevented her from intelligently exercising her peremptory challenges). There is nothing in the record to suggest that defense counsel's expression of satisfaction was a necessary part of trial strategy designed to avoid alienating prospective jurors. See *Leslie v Allen-Bradley Co*, 203 Mich App 490, 493; 513 NW2d 179 (1994). Unlike the defense counsel in *Leslie*, defense counsel here did not renew his objection out of the presence of the jury. Accordingly, defendant has waived this issue for appeal. *Rose*, *supra*, pp 531-532.

Defendant also argues that the prosecutor engaged in several instances of misconduct. We note that defendant objected to only two incidents of the alleged misconduct and did not request any curative instructions. Thus, our review of the other incidents is precluded unless the conduct was so egregious that no curative instruction could have removed any prejudice to defendant, or if manifest injustice would result from our failure to review the alleged misconduct. *People v Paquette,* 214 Mich App 336, 341-342; 543 NW2d 342 (1995).

Defendant maintains that the prosecutor improperly injected irrelevant evidence of defendant's sexual and financial history. We disagree. Whether the defense witnesses or their relatives were intimately involved with defendant and whether they were providing financial support to defendant were relevant factors for the jury to consider in weighing the credibility of the witnesses and in determining whether the witnesses were biased. However, the prosecutor's questions directed to defendant regarding the money she received from other men were irrelevant to any issue in the case. MRE 401. Likewise, it was improper for the prosecutor to force the defense investigator to assert the attorney-client privilege in front of the jury. *People v Paasche,* 207 Mich App 698, 712; 525 NW2d 914 (1994). Nonetheless, given defendant's numerous admissions that she stabbed the decedent, these errors were harmless. *People v Mateo,* 453 Mich 203, 215; 551 NW2d 891 (1996).

Finally, considering the prosecutor's closing argument in its entirety, we conclude that the prosecutor properly argued the evidence and all reasonable inferences from the evidence as it related to the prosecution's theory of the case. No manifest injustice would result from our failure to further review this unpreserved issue. *People v Bahoda,* 448 Mich 261, 282, 285; 531 NW2d 659 (1995); *Paquette*, *supra*, pp 341-342.

Affirmed.

/s/ Michael J. Kelly
/s/ Myron H. Wahls
/s/ Hilda R. Gage