

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of DRIONNA BLANKENSHIP,
DANESHA BLANKENSHIP, TERRANCE
BLANKENSHIP and NORA BLANKENSHIP,
Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

DETRIONNA BLANKENSHIP,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

TIMOTHY HILL, EDWARD FIELDS, NICKO
HARRIS and TYRONE JOHNSON,

Respondents.

UNPUBLISHED

April 23, 1999

No. 210370

Berrien Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 96-000053 NA

Before: Gage, P.J., and Gribbs and Hoekstra, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the family court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), (g) and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), (g) and (j)). We affirm.

The family court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Further, respondent-appellant failed to show that termination of her parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5); *In re*

Hall-Smith, 222 Mich App 470, 473; 564 NW2d 156 (1997). Thus, the family court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to the children. *Id.*

Limiting our review to the record, respondent has not established any basis for relief due to ineffective assistance of counsel. *People v Pickens*, 446 Mich 298, 309; 521 NW2d 797 (1994); *People v Barclay*, 208 Mich App 670, 672; 528 NW2d 842 (1995). Respondent's claim that the statutory framework creates an impermissible conflict-of-interest is not preserved for appellate review because it was not raised below and is not identified in the statement of questions presented. *In re Hildebrant*, 216 Mich App 384, 389; 548 NW2d 715 (1996); MCR 7.212(C)(5).

Affirmed.

/s/ Hilda R. Gage

/s/ Roman S. Gibbs

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra