

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

KAREN GRANDISON, Personal Representative  
of the Estate of KINGDON GRANDISON, JR.,  
Deceased,

UNPUBLISHED  
April 1, 2004

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v

HENRY FORD HOSPITAL,

No. 243087  
Wayne Circuit Court  
LC No. 00-011117-NH

Defendant-Appellee.

---

Before: Zahra, P.J., and Saad and Schuette, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Plaintiff appeals as of right from a circuit court order distributing settlement proceeds in this wrongful death action. We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The surviving spouse, children, and other relations of a decedent are entitled to recover damages in an amount the court “considers fair and equitable considering the relative damages sustained by each” person. MCL 600.2922(3)(a), (6)(d). We review the trial court’s factual findings for clear error but review its distribution of the proceeds, based on its findings, for an abuse of discretion. *Hoogewerf v Kovach*, 185 Mich App 577, 579; 463 NW2d 160 (1990).

Plaintiff first contends that the trial court erred in considering a social worker’s report which contained the deceased’s statements about his marriage because it constituted inadmissible hearsay. Plaintiff did not object to the evidence below and thus the issue has not been preserved for appeal. *In re Weiss*, 227 Mich App 37, 39; 568 NW2d 336 (1997). Because plaintiff has failed to brief the merits of the issue, it is deemed abandoned. *FMB-First Michigan Bank v Bailey*, 232 Mich App 711, 717; 591 NW2d 676 (1998). “An appellant may not merely announce his position and leave it to this Court to discover and rationalize the basis for his claims.” *Green Oak Twp v Munzel*, 255 Mich App 235, 244; 661 NW2d 243 (2003).

Plaintiff next contends that the trial court erred in considering the length of the parties’ relationships with the decedent rather than the quality of their relationships. Both quantity and quality are appropriately considered in determining the type of relationship shared by the claimant and the deceased. *In re Claim of Carr*, 189 Mich App 234, 239; 471 NW2d 637 (1991).

A review of the record shows that the trial court considered both and, in light of the scant evidence presented by the parties, we find no error in the court's findings or distribution.

Plaintiff also asserts that the court erred in taking into consideration her prospects of remarrying and that it demonstrated bias in doing so. Plaintiff has not cited any authority in support of her claim and thus it is deemed abandoned. *Central Cartage Co v Fewless*, 232 Mich App 517, 529; 591 NW2d 422 (1998).

Affirmed.

/s/ Brian K. Zahra

/s/ Henry William Saad

/s/ Bill Schuette