

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

ROSZETTA MARIE MCNEILL,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v

RDH & PEM INVESTMENTS, LLC,

Defendant-Appellee.

UNPUBLISHED
November 20, 2003

No. 241719
Wayne Circuit Court
LC No. 01-112403-CH

Before: Cooper, P.J., and Markey and Meter, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Plaintiff appeals as of right from a circuit court order granting defendant's motion for summary disposition. We affirm.

In this action, plaintiff contends that defendant's attempts to evict her from her apartment constituted an interference with her rights under the Fair Housing Act, 42 USC 3601 *et seq.* Defendant asserted that plaintiff's claim was barred by res judicata because she had raised the same issue in proceedings in the 36th District Court and the federal district court. The trial court agreed and granted defendant's motion. Because it determined that plaintiff's claim was barred, the court found it unnecessary to address defendant's alternative argument under MCR 2.116(C)(10).

On appeal, plaintiff claims that the trial court erred in granting defendant's motion under MCR 2.116(C)(7) (res judicata) and in failing to consider defendant's motion under subrule (C)(10). Because plaintiff has failed to brief properly the merits of her claim or cite any supporting legal authority, the issue is deemed abandoned. *Prince v MacDonald*, 237 Mich App 186, 197; 602 NW2d 834 (1999). It is not sufficient for a party "simply to announce a position or assert an error and then leave it up to this Court to discover and rationalize the basis for his claims, or unravel and elaborate for him his arguments, and then search for authority either to sustain or reject his position." *Wilson v Taylor*, 457 Mich 232, 243; 577 NW2d 100 (1998), quoting *Mitcham v Detroit*, 355 Mich 182, 203; 94 NW2d 388 (1959).

Affirmed.

/s/ Jessica R. Cooper
/s/ Jane E. Markey
/s/ Patrick M. Meter