

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,  
Plaintiff-Appellee,

UNPUBLISHED  
August 15, 2013

v

ADAM MICHAEL SCHAEFER,  
Defendant-Appellant.

No. 311307  
Bay Circuit Court  
LC No. 12-010000-FH

---

Before: SAAD, P.J., and K. F. KELLY and GLEICHER, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Defendant appeals his jury trial convictions of two counts of assaulting, resisting, or obstructing a police officer, MCL 750.81d(1). For the reasons set forth below, we affirm.

Defendant argues that the prosecution presented insufficient evidence to support his two convictions. In “determining whether sufficient evidence has been presented to sustain a conviction, a court must view the evidence in a light most favorable to the prosecution and determine whether any rational trier of fact could have found that the essential elements of the crime were proven beyond a reasonable doubt.” *People v Wolfe*, 440 Mich 508, 515; 489 NW2d 748 (1992), amended 441 Mich 1201 (1992).

The crime of assaulting, resisting, or obstructing a police officer has two elements: “(1) the defendant assaulted, battered, wounded, resisted, obstructed, opposed, or endangered a police officer, and (2) the defendant knew or had reason to know that the person that the defendant assaulted, battered, wounded, resisted, obstructed, opposed, or endangered was a police officer performing his or her duties.” *People v Corr*, 287 Mich App 499, 503; 788 NW2d 860 (2010), citing MCL 750.81d(1). “‘Obstruct’ includes the use or threatened use of physical interference or force or a knowing failure to comply with a lawful command.” MCL 750.81d(7)(a).

Here, Officer Nicholas Pletzke and Corporal Brian Schroer testified that they attempted to break up a fight involving defendant. The officers further testified that they were wearing their police uniforms on the night of the incident and that they repeatedly announced that they were police officers. According to the officers, defendant grabbed Officer Pletzke’s throat and refused to comply with the officers’ commands to stop resisting and their efforts to handcuff him. Viewing the evidence “in a light most favorable to the prosecution,” *Wolfe*, 440 Mich at 515, and because “the issue of credibility is for the jury to decide,” *People v Milstead*, 250 Mich

App 391, 404; 648 NW2d 648 (2002), we hold that a rational jury could find beyond a reasonable doubt that defendant assaulted, resisted, or obstructed a police officer.

In his appeal brief, defendant asserts that the trial court erred by denying his motion for a directed verdict and suggests that the jury verdict was against the great weight of the evidence. However, defendant does not include these challenges in his statement of the issue, nor does he cite any authority related to these claims of error. Thus, defendant has abandoned any claim of error regarding his motion for a directed verdict or the great weight of the evidence. *People v Anderson*, 284 Mich App 11, 16; 772 NW2d 792 (2009); *People v Schumacher*, 276 Mich App 165, 178; 740 NW2d 534 (2007). Moreover, we hold that the record does not support a conclusion that the trial court erred by denying defendant's motion for a directed verdict or that the verdict was against the great weight of the evidence.

Affirmed.

/s/ Henry William Saad  
/s/ Kirsten Frank Kelly  
/s/ Elizabeth L. Gleicher