

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v

STEVEN A. JAMES,

Defendant-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED

September 24, 2002

No. 233755

Wayne Circuit Court

LC No. 00-000996

Before: Whitbeck, C.J., and Sawyer and Kelly, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Defendant was convicted of carrying a concealed weapon (CCW), MCL 750.227, receiving and concealing stolen property under \$20,000 (R&C), MCL 750.535(3)(a), and possession of a firearm during the commission of a felony, MCL 750.227b. He was sentenced to concurrent prison terms of one to five years' for the CCW and R&C convictions, to be served consecutively to the two-year mandatory sentence for felony-firearm. He appeals his sentences as of right. We affirm.

The trial court must articulate on the record its reasons for imposing a particular sentence, MCR 6.425(D)(2)(e); *People v Fleming*, 428 Mich 408, 428; 410 NW2d 266 (1987), but is not required to expressly mention each goal of sentencing when imposing sentence. *People v Rice (On Remand)*, 235 Mich App 429, 446; 597 NW2d 843 (1999). "The purpose of the articulation requirement is to aid appellate review and avoid injustice on the basis of error at sentencing." *People v Terry*, 224 Mich App 447, 455; 569 NW2d 641 (1997). Defendant's sole claim on appeal is that he is entitled to resentencing because the court failed to articulate its reasons for the sentences imposed.

A review of the record shows that the court explained that the two-year sentence for the felony-firearm conviction was mandatory. It did not explain the reasons for the other sentences. However, both sentences were clearly within the statutory guidelines range and because defendant does not claim that the guidelines were not properly scored or that the presentence report contained inaccurate information, this Court is required to affirm the sentences. MCL 769.34(10); *People v Babcock*, 244 Mich App 64, 73; 624 NW2d 479 (2000). Under the

circumstances, a remand for articulation is not required. *People v Beneson*, 192 Mich App 469, 471; 481 NW2d 799 (1992).

Affirmed.

/s/ William C. Whitbeck

/s/ David H. Sawyer

/s/ Kirsten Frank Kelly