STATE OF MICHIGAN COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of CANDICE WILSON, ANTHONY WILSON and ANTWAIN WILSON, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

UNPUBLISHED August 10, 1999

 \mathbf{v}

ANTHONY GREEN BEY,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

YVETTE WILSON,

Respondent.

No. 210858 Oakland Circuit Court Family Division LC No. 95-060200 NA

Before: Sawyer, P.J., and Holbrook, Jr., and W. E. Collette,* JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the family court order terminating his parental rights to Anthony and Antwain Wilson under MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(i), (g), and (h); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(a)(i), (g), and (h). We affirm.

The trial court was authorized to terminate respondent-appellant's parental rights at the initial dispositional hearing pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(4); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(4). After reviewing the record, we conclude that the trial court did not clearly error in finding, on the basis of clear and convincing legally admissible evidence, that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was justified at the initial dispositional hearing pursuant to § 19b(3)(g). In re Miller, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Further, the court did not err in finding that the presumption in favor of

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

termination thereby raised was not overcome by a showing that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights "is clearly not in the child's best interests." MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5). Accord *In re Huisman*, 230 Mich App 372, 385; 584 NW2d 349 (1998). Therefore, we hold that the juvenile court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to the child. *In re Hall-Smith*, 222 Mich App 470, 473; 564 NW2d 156 (1997).

Affirmed.

/s/ David H. Sawyer /s/ Donald E. Holbrook, Jr. /s/ William E. Collette

¹ Even if the trial court erred in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights under §§ 19b(3)(a)(i) and (h), only one statutory ground was required to terminate parental rights. *In re McIntyre*, 192 Mich App 47, 50; 480 NW2d 293 (1991).