

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

ANNIE MARIE ROWADER,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v

FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE
ASSOCIATION,

Defendant-Appellee.

UNPUBLISHED
March 27, 2014

No. 313463
Oakland Circuit Court
LC No. 2012-125198-CH

Before: M. J. KELLY, P.J., and CAVANAGH and FORT HOOD, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

In this action regarding foreclosed property, plaintiff Annie Marie Rowader appeals as of right the trial court's order granting defendant Federal National Mortgage Association's motion for summary disposition pursuant to MCR 2.116(C)(8). We affirm.

Plaintiff executed a mortgage and note with Paramount Bank to obtain a loan for the purchase of a condominium. Eventually, Paramount Bank's interest in the mortgage and note was transferred to defendant. After plaintiff defaulted on the mortgage, defendant exercised its right of sale, and proceeded to foreclose on the property by advertisement. On August 23, 2011, at a public auction, defendant purchased a sheriff's deed for the property.

On February 24, 2012, plaintiff filed this lawsuit, alleging a quiet title claim, unjust enrichment, breach of implied agreement/specific performance, and a violation of MCL 600.3205c. In September 2012, defendant filed a motion for summary disposition, arguing in relevant part that plaintiff's interest in the property had been extinguished therefore plaintiff did not have standing to bring her action. The trial court agreed and granted the motion pursuant to MCR 2.116(C)(8), holding that plaintiff's interest in the property was extinguished when the period of redemption expired; thus, plaintiff did not have standing to bring her claims.

On appeal, plaintiff argues that the trial court's decision should be reversed for several reasons, and she relies on case law unrelated to the issues presented in this matter. Plaintiff's arguments are entirely unrelated to the basis on which summary disposition was granted. Where an appeal fails to address issues that must be reached in order for relief to be granted, this Court need not grant that relief. *Roberts & Son Contracting, Inc v North Oakland Dev Corp*, 163 Mich App 109, 113; 413 NW2d 744 (1987). More specifically, "when an appellant fails to dispute the basis of the trial court's ruling, this Court . . . need not even consider granting plaintiffs the relief

they seek.” *Derderian v Genesys Health Care Sys*, 263 Mich App 364, 381; 689 NW2d 145 (2004). Because plaintiff failed “to dispute the trial court’s ruling,” we “need not [and do not] even consider granting plaintiff[] the relief [she] seek[s].” *Id.*

Affirmed.

/s/ Michael J. Kelly
/s/ Mark J. Cavanagh
/s/ Karen M. Fort Hood