

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

ADAOBI ONYEJEKWULUM,

UNPUBLISHED

March 16, 2023

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v

No. 361167

Oakland Circuit Court

LC No. 2019-877692-DM

EMEKA ONYEJEKWULUM,

Defendant-Appellee.

Before: MURRAY, P.J., and RIORDAN and YATES, JJ.

MURRAY, P.J. (*concurring in part and dissenting in part*).

In the approximately three and a half pages of argument contained in plaintiff’s brief on appeal, she posits two arguments: (1) that the trial court lacked the authority to decide defendant’s motion to allocate child tax credits, and (2) the trial court abused its discretion in not conducting oral argument on the motion. I concur in the majority’s resolution of the second issue, as oral argument is not required to be held on motions, see MCR 2.119(E)(3) and *City of Westland v Kodlowski*, 298 Mich App 647, 662; 828 NW2d 67 (2012), vacated in part on other grounds 495 Mich 871 (2013). With respect to the first issue, I concur that the trial court did not err in addressing defendant’s motion. However, I would go no further in the analysis. Plaintiff, who has counsel on appeal, has not primed the appellate pump with any argument, case law or statute relative to the substance of the trial court’s decision, and we should not make the argument for him. *Mitcham v Detroit*, 355 Mich 182, 203; 94 NW2d 388 (1959). I would affirm.

/s/ Christopher M. Murray