

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

---

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v

MICHAEL T. MURPHY,

Defendant-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

January 17, 1997

No. 190063

Oakland County

LC Nos. 95-138441 FC

95-138442 FC

95-140263 FC

95-140264 FC

---

Before: Markman, P.J., and O’Connell and D. J. Kelly,\* JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Defendant pleaded guilty to three counts of armed robbery, MCL 750.529; MSA 28.284, one count of assault with intent to rob while armed, MCL 750.89; MSA 28.1082, and to being an habitual offender, second offense. MCL 769.10; MSA 28.1082. He was sentenced to four concurrent terms of imprisonment of five to thirty years. He now appeals as of right, challenging the proportionality of the sentences imposed. We affirm.

First, defendant offers no authority for his suggestion that his alleged mental illness and drug addiction justify more lenient sentences than those imposed. We will not search for authority to support a party’s position. *People v Smielewski*, 214 Mich App 55, 64 n 10; 542 NW2d 293 (1995). We decline to address this issue further.

Second, defendant apparently believes that the proportionality of a sentence is reviewed in terms of the upper limit of the sentence range imposed (here, thirty years) rather than in terms of the lower limit of the sentence range imposed (here, five years). It is not. See, e.g., *People v Rivera*, 216 Mich App 648, 652; 550 NW2d 593 (1995).

Finally, contrary to defendant’s assertion that he “really” committed only unarmed robberies and should be sentenced accordingly, “a finger or other object hidden in a bag or under a coat to simulate the appearance of a weapon,” *People v Jolly*, 442 Mich 458, 469; 502 NW2d 177 (1993),

---

\* Circuit judge, sitting on the Court of Appeals by assignment.

is sufficient to satisfy the “dangerous weapon” requirement of the armed robbery statute, MCL 750.529; MCL 28.797.

Because the sentences imposed reflect the seriousness of the matter, *People v Houston*, 448 Mich 312, 320; 532 NW2d 508 (1995), we find no abuse of discretion. *People v Milbourn*, 435 Mich 630, 635-636; 461 NW2d 1 (1990).

Affirmed.

/s/ Stephen J. Markman

/s/ Peter D. O’Connell

/s/ Daniel J. Kelly