

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

---

JOHN COLLIE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v

MUSKEGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE,

Defendant/Cross-Plaintiff-Appellee,

and

HAROLD COLEMAN, MICHELE BAKER, and  
CRAIG DEITERS,

Defendants/Cross-Defendants-  
Appellees,

and

DIANA OSBORNE and JANIE BROOKS,

Defendants/Cross-Plaintiffs,

and

J.D. WILLIAMS,

Defendant.

---

Before: O'CONNELL, P.J., and BANDSTRA and MURRAY, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Plaintiff appeals as of right from the circuit court's orders granting summary disposition to defendants. We affirm. This appeal has been decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

Plaintiff filed suit alleging that he was assaulted at a golf course. Defendant Williams was dismissed for failure of service; the remaining defendants were granted summary disposition. On appeal, plaintiff presents much impassioned factual argument, with few record citations, but virtually no legal authority. We need not address arguments that are not germane to the issues set forth in the statement of questions presented. See MCR 7.212(C)(7); *Meagher v McNeely & Lincoln, Inc*, 212 Mich App 154, 156; 536 NW2d 851 (1995).

Plaintiff's first question is inquiry about the identity of one of the defense lawyers participating below and a statement about paperwork relating to his involvement with the case. Perhaps plaintiff means to suggest that this attorney should have been disqualified, but no disqualification issue arose below, nor would any such issue bear on the propriety of the decision to grant summary disposition. Plaintiff's other question takes issue generally with the trial court's "closing statement" and suggests that the transcripts do not accurately reflect what went on in court. But if that is what plaintiff means, he nonetheless specifies no such falsification, let alone explains how the statements that were actually made in court, as opposed to what the transcripts report, in fact show that defendants were not entitled to summary disposition.

A party's mere assertion that the party's rights were violated, unaccompanied by record citations, cogent argument, or supporting authority, is insufficient to present an issue for this Court's consideration. See *People v Jones (On Rehearing)*, 201 Mich App 449, 456-457; 506 NW2d 542 (1993). Because plaintiff has failed to give this Court any basis to disturb the outcome below, we will not do so.

Affirmed.

/s/ Peter D. O'Connell  
/s/ Richard A. Bandstra  
/s/ Christopher M. Murray