

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

---

In the Matter of DEANGELO DARRYL  
ROBINSON, Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

LARRY ROBINSON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

SHIRLEY IVY CRAIG,

Respondent.

---

In the Matter of DEANGELO DARRYL  
ROBINSON, Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

SHIRLEY IVY CRAIG,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

UNPUBLISHED

April 4, 2000

No. 219547

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 97-357824

No. 219548

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 97-357824

LARRY ROBINSON,

Respondent.

---

Before: Wilder, P.J., and Sawyer and Markey, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

In Docket No. 219547, respondent-appellant Robinson appeals as of right from the family court order terminating his parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(b)(ii), (c)(i), (g) and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(b)(ii), (c)(i), (g) and (j). In Docket No. 219548, respondent-appellant Craig appeals as of right from the family court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under §§ 19b(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j). We affirm. This case is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

Respondent Robinson argues that he was denied due process because personal service was not attempted for the adjourned termination hearing. However, repetitive personal service is unnecessary after an initial summons for a termination hearing has been properly served and the proceedings are subsequently adjourned to a future date. MCR 5.920(F); *In re Atkins*, 237 Mich App 249, 251; 602 NW2d 594 (1999); *In re Andeson*, 155 Mich App 615, 618-619; 400 NW2d 330 (1986).

Respondent Robinson also argues that the trial court abused its discretion in admitting the reports of a caseworker and psychiatrist who were not present at trial. However, because respondent did not object to this evidence in the trial court and has not demonstrated that the admission of the evidence resulted in a miscarriage of justice, appellate relief is precluded. *In re Snyder*, 223 Mich App 85, 92; 566 NW2d 18 (1997).

Respondent Craig argues that petitioner failed to establish that § 19b(3)(g) was established by clear and convincing evidence. However, respondent Craig's parental rights were terminated under §§ 19b(3)(c)(i) and (j), in addition to § 19b(3)(g). Because only one statutory ground is necessary to terminate parental rights and because respondent Craig does not challenge the other statutory grounds relied upon by the trial court as a basis for terminating parental rights, she is not entitled to appellate relief. *In re McIntyre*, 192 Mich App 47, 50; 480 NW2d 293 (1991); *Roberts & Son Contracting, Inc v North Oakland Development Corp*, 163 Mich App 109, 113; 413 NW2d 744 (1987).

Affirmed.

/s/ Kurtis T. Wilder  
/s/ David H. Sawyer  
/s/ Jane E. Markey