

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of KIMBERLY JEAN GARRISON,
KARLA SUE GARRISON, KRYSTAL LYNN
GARRISON, and WILLIAM GARRISON, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

WILLIAM GLENN GARRISON, II,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

MARY CATHERINE S. GARRISON,

Respondent.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

MARY CATHERINE GARRISON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

WILLIAM GARRISON,

UNPUBLISHED

March 3, 1998

No. 203472

Wayne Juvenile Court

LC No. 90-285608

No. 203648

Wayne Juvenile Court

LC No. 90-285608

Respondent.

Before: Michael J. Kelly, P.J., and Fitzgerald and M.G. Harrison*, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

In Docket No. 203472, respondent William Garrison appeals as of right from the juvenile court order terminating his parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (g); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i) and (g). In Docket No. 203648, respondent Mary Garrison appeals as of right from the juvenile court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(b)(i) and (ii), (c)(i), (g), (i) and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(b)(i) and (ii), (c)(i), (g), (i) and (j). We affirm. These consolidated appeals have been decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The juvenile court did not clearly err in finding that at least one of the statutory grounds for termination was established by clear and convincing evidence for each respondent. *In re Hall-Smith*, 222 Mich App 470; 564 NW2d 156 (1997). Contrary to respondent William Garrison's argument, the record does not demonstrate that the juvenile court imputed respondent Mary Garrison's conduct to him. Further, we do not find that the juvenile court's ultimate decision to terminate parental rights was clearly erroneous. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5); *In re Hall-Smith, supra*.

We also find no merit in the respondent Mary Garrison's argument that the juvenile court focused strictly on the prior termination proceeding for her older children in finding statutory grounds for terminating her parental rights to the children at issue in the instant case. Although the court found that she was not successfully rehabilitated, it is clear that the court considered the dispositional information on her efforts to comply with the treatment plan for this case when making that finding. We are not persuaded that the juvenile court clearly erred in finding clear and convincing evidence that respondent Mary Garrison was not successfully rehabilitated or in determining that statutory grounds for termination were proven. *In re Hall-Smith, supra*; *In re Powers*, 208 Mich App 582; 528 NW2d 799 (1995). Further, we are not persuaded that the juvenile court's decision was barred by the doctrine of collateral estoppel. See *Horn v Dep't of Corrections*, 216 Mich App 58, 62; 548 NW2d 660 (1996).

Affirmed.

/s/ Michael J. Kelly
/s/ E. Thomas Fitzgerald
/s/ Michael G. Harrison

* Circuit judge, sitting on the Court of Appeals by assignment.