

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of SHANTILY PORTER, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

KENNETH PORTER,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

February 11, 2000

No. 221655

Kent Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 98-001034-NA

Before: O'Connell, P.J., and Meter and T. G. Hicks*, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

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

Respondent's claim that the family court improperly terminated his parental rights is deficient in that respondent does not direct his arguments at any of the individual elements of the applicable statutory grounds for termination. See *Goolsby v Detroit*, 419 Mich 651, 655 n 1; 358 NW2d 856 (1984), and *Roberts & Sons Contracting, Inc v North Oakland Development Corp*, 163 Mich App 109, 111; 413 NW2d 744 (1987) (failure to brief a necessary issue precludes appellate relief). In any event, we are satisfied that the trial court did not clearly err in determining that §19b(3)(g) was established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Sours*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999). Because only one statutory ground is required in order to terminate parental rights, we need not decide whether termination was warranted on alternative grounds. See *In re Huisman*, 230 Mich App 372, 384-385; 584 NW2d 349 (1998). Moreover, respondent failed to show that termination of his parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5); *In re Hall-Smith*, 222 Mich App 470, 472-473; 564 NW2d 156 (1997).

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

Finally, we reject respondent's argument that petitioner failed to make reasonable efforts toward reunification of the family.

Affirmed.

/s/ Peter D. O'Connell

/s/ Patrick M. Meter

/s/ Timothy G. Hicks