

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of BEATRICE BONNIE LANE, a/k/a BEATRICE
BONNIE JONES, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

HUBERT LANE,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

RAMONA JONES,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

March 24, 1998

No. 205594

Wayne Juvenile Court

LC No. 95-329098

Before: Fitzgerald, P.J., and Hood and Sawyer, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant Hubert Lane (hereinafter respondent) appeals as of right from a juvenile court order terminating his parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii),(c)(i),(g), and (h); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(a)(ii),(c)(i),(g) and (h), in accordance with the decision of the probated court referee. We affirm.

As an initial matter, we note that respondent's brief addresses only two of the four statutory grounds for termination that were found to exist by the juvenile court, those being §§ 19b(3)(c)(i) and (g). Because respondent does not address the probate court's ruling with respect to §§ 19b(a)(ii) or (h), appellate relief is not warranted. See *Joerger v Gordon Food, Inc*, 224 Mich App 167, 175; 568 NW2d 365 (1997); *Roberts & Son Contracting, Inc v North Oakland Development Corp*, 163 Mich App 109, 113; 413 NW2d 744 (1987) (relief is precluded when the appellant fails to address an issue which necessarily must be reached).

In any event, the juvenile court did not clearly err in finding that §§ 19b(3)(c)(i) and (g) were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Further, respondent failed to show that termination of his parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interest. *In re Hall-Smith*, 222 Mich App 470, 472-473; 564 NW2d 156 (1997). Thus, the juvenile court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the child. MCL 712.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5).

Affirmed.

/s/ E. Thomas Fitzgerald

/s/ Harold Hood

/s/ David H. Sawyer