

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,  
  
Plaintiff-Appellee,

UNPUBLISHED  
June 12, 2012

v

DAKOTA LYNN SHANANAQUET,  
  
Defendant-Appellant.

No. 304537  
Emmet Circuit Court  
LC No. 10-003343-FH

---

Before: JANSEN, P.J., and CAVANAGH and HOEKSTRA, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Defendant was convicted by a jury of falsely reporting a felony, MCL 750.411a(1)(b). She was sentenced to 12 months' jail time and two years' probation. Defendant appeals by right. We affirm.

We review de novo a challenge to the sufficiency of the evidence.<sup>1</sup> "Taking the evidence in the light most favorable to the prosecution, the question on appeal is whether a rational trier of fact could find the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt."<sup>2</sup> It is the role of the jury to "determine questions of fact and assess the credibility of witnesses."<sup>3</sup>

MCL 750.411a makes it a crime to falsely file a police report. The statute provides, in relevant part:

[A] person who intentionally makes a false report of the commission of a crime, or intentionally causes a false report of the commission of a crime to be made, to a peace officer, police agency of this state or of a local unit of government, 9-1-1 operator, or any other governmental employee or contractor or

---

<sup>1</sup> *People v Lueth*, 253 Mich App 670, 680; 660 NW2d 322 (2002).

<sup>2</sup> *People v Hardiman*, 466 Mich 417, 421; 646 NW2d 158 (2002).

<sup>3</sup> *People v Cameron*, 291 Mich App 599, 616; 806 NW2d 371 (2011) (citation omitted).

employee of a contractor who is authorized to receive reports of a crime, knowing the report is false, is guilty of a crime. . . .<sup>4</sup>

If a person falsely reports a felony, the crime of false reporting is itself a felony.<sup>5</sup> “[T]he plain language of the statute is not limited to only those situations where no crime has been committed; it also applies where one reports false details about the crime.”<sup>6</sup>

Defendant reported a felonious assault to police. Specifically, defendant claimed that a man and a woman broke into her home and attempted to rob her. Defendant reported that she was stabbed by the female intruder, and that she stabbed both of the intruders in return. Defendant claimed to know at least one of the intruders, and reported that their motive was retaliation against defendant for testimony defendant had given in a child custody matter. Subsequent police investigations and forensic tests revealed inconsistencies in defendant’s story, giving rise to her prosecution for false reporting.

The evidence strongly suggests that the entire report of felonious assault was false. Defendant reported to police several times that she seriously injured the intruders with a kitchen knife, but only a small amount of blood was found at the scene. An investigating officer testified that, had defendant stabbed her intruders in the way she described, there would have been blood “scattered everywhere.” Moreover, three DNA tests indicated that the blood that was recovered from the scene was defendant’s, and not a third party’s. An investigating officer testified that the window the intruders allegedly used to enter the house appeared to have been broken from the inside. A police tracking dog found no scent of the intruders, and no trail of blood was found leading away from the home. Defendant left her two young boys at her house when she went to a neighbor’s house for help, suggesting that defendant believed that there was not any real danger. Her boys were calm when a neighbor later found them. Defendant claimed certainty of her intruders’ identity, but her description of the male intruder was inaccurate.<sup>7</sup> Only hours after the alleged incident, the person defendant identified as the male intruder was found unharmed; he had not been stabbed, as defendant claimed. Police testimony also indicated that defendant’s wounds were self-inflicted. Accordingly, viewing the evidence in the light most favorable to the prosecutor, there was sufficient evidence presented to support defendant’s conviction of falsely reporting a felony.

Defendant concedes in her brief that “she exaggerated the extent of her injuries and those she claims to have afflicted (sic) on her assailants.” Our Supreme Court has held that “[o]ne who

---

<sup>4</sup> MCL 750.411a(1).

<sup>5</sup> MCL 750.411a(1)(b).

<sup>6</sup> *People v Chavis*, 468 Mich 84, 94; 658 NW2d 469 (2003) (emphasis omitted).

<sup>7</sup> A deputy sheriff testified that defendant described the male intruder as tall, thin, and blonde. When informed that the man was short with brown hair, defendant said “you’re right, he’s not tall . . . he has more like brownish hair.”

provides false details about the crime has made a false report [regarding the commission of] a crime.”<sup>8</sup> Accordingly, defendant admits that her actions amounted to the standard for conviction of the offense with which she was charged.

Defendant notes that her fiancé testified regarding the amount of blood in the house, and argues that her fiancé’s testimony contradicts the police testimony regarding the lack of a significant amount of blood. Similarly, defendant’s son testified that he saw defendant’s leg bleeding. Because it convicted defendant, the jury apparently found credible inculpatory testimony from the police and did not find credible exculpatory testimony from defendant’s fiancé and son. The credibility of witnesses is an issue for the jury, not this Court.<sup>9</sup> Accordingly, that there was some contradictory testimony presented at trial is not, without more, a basis for reversal.

Affirmed.

/s/ Kathleen Jansen  
/s/ Mark J. Cavanagh  
/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra

---

<sup>8</sup> *Chavis*, 468 Mich at 94.

<sup>9</sup> *Cameron*, 291 Mich App at 616.