

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

GENRE BROGUE,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v

COMCAST,

Defendant-Appellee.

---

UNPUBLISHED

February 17, 2011

No. 295422

Wayne Circuit Court

LC No. 08-015317-CZ

Before: HOEKSTRA, P.J., and FITZGERALD and BECKERING, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Plaintiff Genre Brogue, proceeding in propria persona, appeals as of right the trial court's December 2, 2009 order denying her motion for entry of a default judgment and dismissing her complaint without prejudice for failure to properly serve defendant Comcast within the period set forth in the summons. We affirm.<sup>1</sup> This appeal has been decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

Review of the lower court record reveals that the trial court, relying on the information provided in plaintiff's proof of service, dismissed plaintiff's action for failure to properly serve defendant in accordance with MCR 2.105(D) within the life of the summons. Such dismissal is authorized by MCR 2.102(E). On appeal, plaintiff contends that the trial court should not be allowed to issue an opinion and order based on error that deprives plaintiff of her "settlements." However, plaintiff has not provided any cogent argument to demonstrate that the trial court's dismissal of this action for failure of proper service was based on an error of law or fact. An appellant must do more than "simply announce a position or assert an error . . . ." *Mitcham v Detroit*, 355 Mich 182, 203; 94 NW2d 388 (1959). It is incumbent upon plaintiff to address the basis of the trial court's ruling, *Derderian v Genesys Health Care Sys*, 263 Mich App 364, 381; 689 NW2d 145 (2004), and to "adequately prime the pump" for the appellate well to flow by explaining the basis of her arguments and supporting them with citations to relevant authorities,

---

<sup>1</sup> We agree with defendant that our jurisdiction in this appeal is limited to review of the circuit court action and, accordingly, does not encompass a related proceeding before the Public Service Commission. However, plaintiff's arguments do not relate to that proceeding.

*Goolsby v Detroit*, 419 Mich 651, 655 n 1; 358 NW2d 856 (1984), quoting *Mitcham*, 355 Mich at 203. Plaintiff has wholly failed to meet these requirements. This Court will not “discover and rationalize the basis for [her] claims, or unravel and elaborate for [her her] arguments, and then search for authority either to sustain or reject [her] position.” *Mitcham*, 355 Mich at 203.

Plaintiff also asks this Court to “procure and relinquish” her “settlements.” This requested relief is beyond the purpose and function of this Court. Plaintiff fails to recognize that “this Court functions as a court of review that is principally charged with the duty of correcting errors.” *Mich Up & Out of Poverty Now Coalition v State of Mich*, 210 Mich App 162, 168; 533 NW2d 339 (1995). Accordingly, we deny plaintiff’s requested relief.

Affirmed.

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra  
/s/ E. Thomas Fitzgerald  
/s/ Jane M. Beckering