

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v

DAVID L. SANDERS,

Defendant-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

February 2, 2001

No. 219703

Wayne Circuit Court

LC No. 97-010444

Before: Collins, P.J., and Doctoroff and White, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Defendant appeals as of right his bench trial convictions for assault with intent to murder, MCL 750.83; MSA 28.278, home invasion, MCL 750.110a(2); MSA 28.305(a); and felony-firearm, MCL 750.227b; MSA 28.424(2). The trial court found defendant guilty but mentally ill. We affirm.

On appeal, defendant argues that the trial court did not make adequate findings of fact, and that there was insufficient evidence to establish his intent to commit the crimes. We disagree.

MCR 2.517 requires a trial court sitting without a jury to find the facts specially, state separately its conclusions of law, and direct entry of the appropriate judgment. The requirements of the court rule are satisfied as long as it appears from the court's findings that the court was aware of the factual issues and correctly applied the law. *People v Wardlaw*, 190 Mich App 318; 475 NW2d 387 (1991). Here, the trial court fully summarized the facts of the case, and correctly focused on the central factual issue of defendant's sanity. The findings were adequate to meet the requirements of MCR 2.517.

Further, there was sufficient evidence of defendant's intent to support the convictions. In determining whether sufficient evidence has been presented to sustain a conviction, a reviewing court must view the evidence in a light most favorable to the prosecution, and determine whether any rational finder of fact could have found that the essential elements of the crime were proven beyond a reasonable doubt. *People v Wolfe*, 440 Mich 508, 515; 489 NW2d 748 (1992).

The prosecution presented expert testimony sufficient to support the court's finding that defendant was culpable for the crimes. The expert found that defendant exhibited some stressors,

but his behavior did not show genuine mental illness where there was no behavioral disturbance. She opined that defendant was not lacking in the capacity to form specific intent. Viewed in a light most favorable to the prosecution, this testimony was sufficient to support the verdict. *Wolfe, supra*.

Affirmed.

/s/ Jeffrey G. Collins

/s/ Martin M. Doctoroff

/s/ Helene N. White