STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF APPEALS

KAREN HOWARD,

UNPUBLISHED October 29, 1999

Plaintiff-Appellant,

V

No. 203209 Ontonagon Circuit Court LC No. 95-000024 NO

SCOTT MILES,

Defendant,

and

COPPER RANGE, INC.,

Defendant-Appellee.

Before: Griffin, P.J., and Sawyer and Smolenski, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

In her first amended complaint, plaintiff alleged that she received obscene telephone calls from defendant Scott Miles while he was employed at defendant Copper Range Inc.'s facility. Plaintiff further alleged that Copper Range's negligent supervision of Miles permitted the calls to continue and that she suffered emotional distress, mental suffering and other damages as a result of Copper Range's negligence. The trial court subsequently granted Copper Range's motion for summary disposition as to plaintiff's negligent supervision claim pursuant to MCR 2.116(C)(10). Plaintiff appeals as of right. We affirm. ¹

On appeal, plaintiff challenges the trial court's dismissal of her negligent supervision claim. However, we are unable to reach the merits of plaintiff's challenge in this appeal because her brief fails to cite any authority relative to Copper Range's alleged liability for negligent supervision. As our Supreme Court stated in *Mudge v Macomb Co*, 458 Mich 87, 104-105; 580 NW2d 845 (1998), quoting *Mitcham v Detroit*, 355 Mich 182, 203; 94 NW2d 388 (1959):

It is not enough for an appellant in his brief simply to announce a position or assert an error and then leave it up to this Court to discover and rationalize the basis for

his claims, or unravel and elaborate for him his arguments, and then search for authority either to sustain or reject his position. The appellant himself must first adequately prime the pump; only then does the appellate well begin to flow.

Because plaintiff has failed to support her argument by citation of legal authority, she has waived her sole issue on appeal. *In re Contempt of Barnett*, 233 Mich App 188, 191; 592 NW2d 431 (1998).

Affirmed.

/s/ Richard Allen Griffin

/s/ David H. Sawyer

/s/ Michael R. Smolenski

¹ Plaintiff does not appeal from the May 3, 1996 order granting summary disposition of her premises liability and respondeat superior claims.