

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

NELSON PO,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v

CLARITA PO,

Defendant-Appellee.

UNPUBLISHED

June 18, 2002

No. 229473

Wayne Circuit Court

LC No. 99-918242-NI

Before: Bandstra, P.J., and Smolenski and Meter, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Plaintiff appeals by right from a jury verdict of no cause of action in this negligence suit. We affirm.

Plaintiff first argues that the trial court erred by admitting a statement contained in plaintiff's medical records that was unnecessary for diagnosis or treatment of his injuries. See MRE 803(4). However, plaintiff moved to admit the medical records at trial and did not seek to redact the statement at issue. A party may not seek redress on appeal for alleged error to which he contributed by plan or negligence. *Farm Credit Services v Weldon*, 232 Mich App 662, 683-684; 591 NW2d 438 (1998). Plaintiff waived review of the admission of this evidence because he introduced it. See generally *City of Troy v McMaster*, 154 Mich App 564, 570-571; 398 NW2d 469 (1986).

Next, plaintiff argues that the jury's verdict was against the great weight of the evidence. Plaintiff also waived appellate review of this issue by failing to raise it in a motion for a new trial before the trial court,¹ *Rickwalt v Richfield Lakes Corp*, 246 Mich App 450, 464; 633 NW2d 418 (2001), and we discern no miscarriage of justice warranting further action.

¹ Plaintiff contends on appeal that a motion for a new trial was not filed because his trial counsel terminated representation after the trial. Plaintiff does not support this contention by any references to the record, and we note that a party may not enlarge the factual record on appeal. See *Wiand v Wiand*, 178 Mich App 137, 143; 443 NW2d 464 (1989). At any rate, the alleged termination did not excuse plaintiff's failure to preserve the issue.

Affirmed.

/s/ Richard A. Bandstra
/s/ Michael R. Smolenski
/s/ Patrick M. Meter