

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In re Estate of KEVIN STASA, Deceased.

BERNICE STASA, as Personal Representative of the
Estate of KEVIN STASA,

UNPUBLISHED
April 6, 1999

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

No. 205385
Shiawassee Probate Court
LC No. 96-029282

FRANK STASA,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

ALICE STASA,

Respondent.

Before: Holbrook, Jr., P.J., and Murphy and Talbot, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondent appeals in propria persona as of right the probate court's order denying the claims that he and his wife filed against decedent's estate and authorizing possession and sale of estate property. We affirm.

Respondent generally argues that the probate court erroneously ordered respondents to relinquish possession of estate assets and to order their sale. However, respondent failed to file for our review the transcript of the hearing relevant to the August 8, 1997, order from which he appeals. See MCR 7.210(B)(1)(b); *Myers v Jarnac*, 189 Mich App 436, 444; 474 NW2d 302 (1991). After reviewing respondent's arguments included in his brief on appeal, we also find that he has failed to argue the merits of the issues presented. An appellant may not merely announce his position and leave it to this Court to discover and rationalize the basis for his claims. *Wilson v Taylor*, 457 Mich 232, 243; 577 NW2d 100 (1998); see also MCR 7.212(C)(7). Nor may an appellant provide cursory treatment

of issues with little or no citation of supporting authority. *Goolsby v Detroit*, 419 Mich 651, 655 n 1; 358 NW2d 856 (1984); *Community Nat'l Bk of Pontiac v Michigan Basic Property Ins Ass'n*, 159 Mich App 510, 520-521; 407 NW2d 31 (1987). Accordingly, respondent's issues on appeal are not properly presented for our review.

In addition, we find that the probate court properly resolved the issues below. The probate court had authority to administer, settle, and distribute decedent's estate, MCL 700.21(a)(ii) and (v); MSA 27.5021(a)(ii) and (v), and jurisdiction over interested parties, MCL 700.607; MSA 27.5607. Respondent fails to cite any legal authority for his refusal to relinquish possession of the property. We conclude that the probate court acted within its discretion in distributing the estate assets notwithstanding respondent's general disagreement with its orders. Moreover, because this Court previously denied respondent's motion for a stay of the order pending appeal, we believe the court did not improperly deny respondent's request for a stay pending appeal.

Affirmed.

/s/ Donald E. Holbrook, Jr.

/s/ William B. Murphy

/s/ Michael J. Talbot