

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

THOMAS S. EVELAND,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v

DOUGLAS MCPHERSON,

Defendant-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

April 18, 2000

No. 210747

Eaton Circuit Court

LC No. 96-001639-CH

GREG MICHAEL HOCKING,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v

DOUGLAS MCPHERSON,

Defendant-Appellant.

No. 210761

Eaton Circuit Court

LC No. 96-001640-CH

Before: Gribbs, P.J., and Doctoroff and T.L. Ludington*, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

In these consolidated cases, defendant, acting *in propria persona*, appeals as of right from orders entered by the trial court granting judgments in favor of plaintiffs. We affirm.

Defendant filed liens against properties owned by plaintiffs, who at the time were elected judges of the 56th Judicial Circuit for the State of Michigan. Defendant filed the liens to guarantee the existence of a form of compensation to be paid for plaintiffs' "crimes" against him. Accompanying the liens was a document entitled "United States Constitutional Citation Criminal Complaint," in which defendant accused plaintiffs of violating his constitutional rights.

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

Plaintiffs filed complaints to remove the liens and to quiet their titles. The trial court, on its own motion, granted summary disposition in favor of plaintiffs, declared the liens void, and quieted their titles. Subsequently, the trial court entered judgments in favor of plaintiffs, and awarded each plaintiff damages in the amount of \$2,673.10.

We review a trial court's decision on a motion for summary disposition de novo. *Harrison v Olde Financial Corp*, 225 Mich App 601, 605; 572 NW2d 679 (1997).

On appeal, defendant argues that the trial court erred by granting judgments in favor of plaintiffs. We disagree and affirm. Defendant's argument on appeal is virtually unintelligible. Contrary to his assertion, the trial court had subject matter jurisdiction to consider plaintiffs' complaints. MCL 600.605; MSA 27A.605. Defendant does not address the basis of the trial court's decision that plaintiffs were entitled to judgments, as required, *Joerger v Gordon Food Service, Inc*, 224 Mich App 167, 175; 568 NW2d 365 (1997), and cites no pertinent authority to support his assertion that the trial court erred. A party may not leave it to this Court to search for appropriate authority to support its position. *McPeak v McPeak (On Remand)*, 233 Mich App 483, 495-496; 593 NW2d 180 (1999). Defendant has presented no proper issue for review.

Affirmed.

/s/ Roman S. Gibbs
/s/ Martin M. Doctoroff
/s/ Thomas L. Ludington