

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of TAMMY MCCARTHY and  
MICHAEL FRASER, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

RUTH ANN FRASER,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

JOHN S. FRASER and JOSEPH MCCARTHY,

Respondents.

---

UNPUBLISHED

September 25, 1998

No. 207601

Washtenaw Juvenile Court

LC No. 97-024539 NA

Before: Holbrook, Jr., P.J., and Wahls and Cavanagh, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from a juvenile court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(b)(i), (b)(ii) and (g); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(b)(i), (b)(ii) and (g). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

Respondent-appellant first argues that the juvenile court failed to make reasonable accommodations for her hearing impairment. We disagree. The record indicates that reasonable steps were taken to accommodate respondent-appellant's hearing deficiency. It is not apparent from the record that respondent-appellant suffered any prejudice as a result of her impaired hearing.



Next, any claim of error arising from an attorney's temporary representation of multiple parties, to wit: the minor children, the father of one of the children, and the guardian ad litem for respondent-appellant, has been waived because respondent-appellant did not object to the representation below and because respondent-appellant does not assert that any alleged error was decisive of the outcome, nor is any prejudice apparent. See *People v Grant*, 445 Mich 535, 553; 520 NW2d 123 (1994).

Finally, the juvenile court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. See *In re Hall-Smith*, 222 Mich App 470, 472; 564 NW2d 156 (1997); *In re Conley*, 216 Mich App 41, 42; 549 NW2d 353 (1996). There is no requirement that reasonable efforts be made to rectify the conditions that led to removal where, as here, termination was justified at the initial disposition. MCR 5.974(D). Finally, because respondent-appellant failed to provide evidence from which the court could conclude that termination of parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests, the juvenile court did not err in terminating her parental rights. See MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5); *Hall-Smith, supra*.

Affirmed.

/s/ Donald E. Holbrook, Jr.

/s/ Myron H. Wahls

/s/ Mark J. Cavanagh