

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

---

In the Matter of ALLANTAE'Y RAJAIE MOTLEY,  
DEMARCUS DONTA'Y MOTLEY, MENYON  
CHASMIER MOTLEY and SHAQUILLE  
SHAKOUR FITZGERALD, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

DELORES COSTELLA MOTLEY, ANTOINE  
DODSON, SIDNEY TRIMBLE and MARCELLUS  
EASTLAND,

Respondents,

and

REGINALD STUART DOUGLAS,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

In the Matter of ALLANTAE'Y RAJAIE MOTLEY,  
DEMARCUS DONTA'Y MOTLEY, MENYON  
CHASMIER MOTLEY and SHAQUILLE  
SHAKOUR FITZGERALD, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

UNPUBLISHED  
June 9, 2000

No. 220347  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 97-357941

No. 221621

DELORES COSTELLA MOTLEY,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

REGINALD STUART DOUGLAS, ANTOINE  
DODSON, SIDNEY TRIMBLE and MARCELLUS  
EASTLAND,

Respondents.

Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 97-357941

---

Before: Hoekstra, P.J., and Holbrook, Jr. and Zahra, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

In Docket No. 220347, respondent-appellant Reginald Douglas appeals as of right the termination of his parental rights to the minor child, Allantae'y Motley, pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j). In Docket No. 221621, respondent-appellant Delores Motley appeals as of right the termination of her parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j). We affirm.

Only one statutory ground must be established in order to terminate parental rights. *In re Huisman*, 230 Mich App 372, 384-385; 584 NW2d 349 (1998). Here, we conclude that the family court did not clearly err in finding that §§ 19b(3)(c)(i) and (g) were both established by clear and convincing evidence with respect to each respondent. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Accordingly, we need not decide whether termination was also proper under § 19b(3)(j). *In re Huisman, supra*. Because respondents-appellants failed to show that termination of their parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests, MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5), the family court did not err in terminating their parental rights. *In re Boursaw*, 239 Mich App 161, 179-180; 607 NW2d 408 (1999); *In re Hall-Smith*, 222 Mich App 470, 472-473; 564 NW2d 156 (1997).

Affirmed.

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra  
/s/ Donald E. Holbrook, Jr.  
/s/ Brian K. Zahra