

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

---

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v

JASON CHARLES BARNES,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED

June 30, 2000

No. 217049

Oscoda Circuit Court

LC No. 97-000603-FH

Before: Jansen, P.J., and Hood and Saad, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Defendant appeals as of right from a circuit court order revoking his probation for violating a condition of probation that he successfully complete a ninety-day Special Alternative Incarceration Program. The trial court sentenced defendant to serve two to four years in prison on his underlying conviction of larceny in a building, MCL 750.360; MSA 28.592. We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

Defendant argues on appeal that his probation should not have been revoked because he was not provided a written copy of the rules of the SAI boot camp program. Given that defendant did not raise this issue below, we review it only to the extent that plain error occurred that was outcome determinative. See *People v Lane*, 453 Mich 132, 140; 551 NW2d 382 (1996); *People v Grant*, 445 Mich 535, 553; 520 NW2d 123 (1994). We find no such error.

Plaintiff notes on appeal that DOC PD-04.01.130 provides for the issuance of a guidebook to each SAI participant, which includes the program's rules, schedules, and standards. Each program participant is required to sign a receipt for the guidebook. Plaintiff has submitted a copy of a guidebook receipt, which states: "I HAVE READ AND UNDERSTAND THE RULES." The receipt appears to be signed by defendant (although it was apparently issued to another trainee). Given these circumstances, we reject defendant's argument.

Further, to the extent that defendant argues that the trial court revoked probation only on the basis that defendant had been terminated from the boot camp program, and refused to determine whether such termination was in fact appropriate, the argument must fail. As plaintiff properly notes,

trial courts are not expected “to become intricately involved in the management or supervision of a myriad of programs available to probationers,” but rather may “accede to the rules and procedures of a rehabilitation program as formulated by the program’s employees.” *People v Peters*, 191 Mich App 159, 164, 166; 477 NW2d 479 (1991). Accordingly, the trial court did not abuse its discretion in relying on the testimony of the boot camp program manager that defendant violated an established rule, resulting in his termination from the program.

Affirmed.

/s/ Kathleen Jansen

/s/ Harold Hood

/s/ Henry William Saad