

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

MADISON ANDERSON,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v

FORD MOTOR COMPANY,

Defendant-Appellee.

UNPUBLISHED

March 24, 1998

No. 197899

Wayne Circuit Court

LC No. 95-530780-CZ

Before: Doctoroff, P.J., and Reilly and Allen*, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Plaintiff appeals as of right from an order granting summary disposition in favor of defendant under MCR 2.116(C)(7), (C)(8), and (C)(10). We affirm.

Plaintiff's claim is barred by the statute of limitations. MCR 2.116(C)(7). The three-year period of limitations for injuries to a person, now contained in MCL 600.5805(8); MSA 27A.5805(8), applies to a claim for employment discrimination. *Slayton v Michigan Host, Inc*, 144 Mich App 535, 553; 376 NW2d 664 (1985). See also *Gilbert v Grand Trunk*, 95 Mich App 308, 317; 290 NW2d 426 (1980). The pleadings and undisputed evidence of record establish that any employment discrimination by defendant did not occur within the three-year period preceding the filing of plaintiff's complaint. Furthermore, there is no evidence to support plaintiff's claim that the statute of limitations was tolled by continuing discrimination. Accordingly, plaintiff's claim is barred as it relates to defendant's refusal to schedule plaintiff to work.

Plaintiff's argument that the limitations period should run from the date that a grievance procedure conducted between plaintiff's union and defendant was completed is not preserved for appellate review. *Adam v Sylvan Glynn*, 197 Mich App 95, 98; 494 NW2d 791 (1992). Moreover, this Court will not search for authority to support a party's position. *Weiss v Hodge (After Remand)*, 223 Mich App 620, 637; 567 NW2d 468 (1997).

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

Finally, the trial court correctly determined that plaintiff's state civil rights claim was preempted by § 301 of the Labor Management Relations Act, 29 USC 185, because plaintiff's claim is substantially dependent upon an analysis of the collective bargaining agreement. MCR 2.116(C)(10); *Cuffe v GMC (On Rem)*, 180 Mich App 394, 395-396; 446 NW2d 903 (1989)

In light of our resolution of the above issue, we need not reach plaintiff's remaining arguments on appeal.

Affirmed.

/s/ Martin M. Doctoroff

/s/ Maureen Pulte Reilly

/s/ Glenn S. Allen, Jr.