STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF APPEALS

JENNIFER L. MASTERS, a/k/a
JENNIFER MASTERS MASCIA,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v

XEROX CORPORATION,

Defendant-Appellee.

UNPUBLISHED
September 3, 1999

No. 208753
Oakland Circuit Court
LC No. 96-532110 NO

Before: Gribbs, P.J., and Smolenski and Gage, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Plaintiff appeals as of right the trial court's order granting summary disposition in favor of defendant in this product liability action. We affirm.

Plaintiff cut her hand while clearing a paper jam from a photocopy machine manufactured and serviced by defendant. Plaintiff stated in her deposition that the copy machine jammed on a daily basis and that she had become very adept at clearing paper jams. She also stated that she did not know what caused her injury or on what she cut her hand. She simply saw the paper, grabbed it and pulled it out. After she had her hand out of the machine, she saw a scratch that then started to bleed. Two service technicians testified in their depositions that there are no sharp parts inside the machine and that a person would have to have their hand deep inside the machine before they encountered any part that might cause an injury. They were not aware of any defects or dangerous conditions in the copy machine. Inspection by one technician after plaintiff's injury revealed no sharp or jagged parts.

Defendant moved for summary disposition on the basis of plaintiff's deposition testimony that she did not know what she nicked her hand on. The trial court ruled that because of plaintiff's inability to state what caused her injury, and the absence of any facts showing whether the alleged defective copy machine caused plaintiff's injuries, she was unable to prove a causal connection between the alleged dangerous condition and her injury. The court granted summary disposition under MCR 2.116(C)(10).

We review de novo a trial court's grant or denial of a motion for summary disposition. *Marlo Beauty Supply, Inc v Farmers Ins Group of Companies*, 227 Mich App 309, 320-321; 575 NW2d 324 (1998). A motion for summary disposition under MCR 2.116(C)(10) tests the factual support for a claim. *Lash v Allstate Ins Co*, 210 Mich App 98, 101; 532 NW2d 869 (1995). In reviewing a trial court's decision with regard to a motion for summary disposition brought pursuant to MCR 2.116(C)(10), we examine all relevant affidavits, depositions, admissions, and other documentary evidence and construe the evidence in favor of the nonmoving party. *Marlo Beauty, supra* at 320. This Court then determines whether a genuine issue of material fact exists on which reasonable minds could differ. *Id.* This Court is liberal in finding a genuine issue of material fact. *Lash, supra* at 101.

Initially, we note that, other than case law stating the standard for deciding motions for summary disposition, plaintiff has failed to support her arguments with citation to legal authority and, consequently, this Court may deem her arguments abandoned on appeal. *Mitchell v Dahlberg*, 215 Mich App 718, 728; 547 NW2d 74 (1996). As the Supreme Court stated in *Mitcham v City of Detroit*, 355 Mich 182, 203; 94 NW2d 388 (1959):

> It is not enough for an appellant in his brief 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. The appellant himself must first adequately prime the pump; only then does the appellate well begin to flow.

When an issue is inadequately briefed, this Court need not reach it. *Mudge v Macomb Co*, 458 Mich 87, 104; 580 NW2d 845 (1998). A single citation to *Skinner v Square D Co*, 445 Mich 153; 516 NW2d 475 (1994), in support of plaintiff's many-faceted argument, without any analysis, is inadequate.

Nevertheless, plaintiff's sworn deposition testimony, that she could not identify what caused her injury, as well as the testimony of the two Xerox technicians, was sufficient basis for the trial court to rule that there was no genuine issue of material fact with respect to causation. *State Farm Fire & Cas Co v Moss*, 182 Mich App 559, 562; 452 NW2d 816 (1989). Plaintiff's claim that she could not show causation because defendant failed to produce complete service records for the copy machine is contradicted by her clear deposition testimony. Even if more extensive service records were available, discovery of those documents would have been futile in light of plaintiff's admission that she did not know what she cut her finger on. *Adams v Perry Furniture Co (On Remand)*, 198 Mich App 1, 14-15; 497 NW2d 514 (1993). Moreover, if plaintiff believed that defendant violated the court's order to produce the documents, she could have filed a motion for sanctions. MCR 2.313(B).

Since the cause of plaintiff's injury remains one of pure speculation or conjecture, she has not met her burden of showing that defendant supplied a defective copy machine and that the

defect caused her injury. *Auto Club Ins Ass'n v General Motors Corp*, 217 Mich App 594, 604; 552 NW2d 523 (1996). Therefore, summary disposition was appropriate.

Affirmed.

/s/ Roman S. Gribbs
/s/ Michael R. Smolenski
/s/ Hilda R. Gage