

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

---

In the Matter of BOBBY CHARLES HAWKINS,  
JR., Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

CHARLES HAWKINS, SR., a/k/a BOBBY  
CHARLES HAWKINS, SR.,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

SIDNEY ARLENE GORDON,

Respondent.

---

UNPUBLISHED

June 23, 2000

No. 220663

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 88-269333

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

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the family court order terminating his parental rights to the minor child 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.

Only one statutory ground is required to terminate parental rights. *In re McIntyre*, 192 Mich App 47, 50; 480 NW2d 293 (1991). Although the family court erred in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights under § 19b(3)(a)(ii), the court did not clearly err in finding that the remaining statutory grounds for termination, §§ 19b(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j), were each 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 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). Acknowledging the importance of child-parent relationship, we nonetheless believe that the record supports the conclusion that the best interests of the child is served by termination of respondent father's parental rights. *In re Boursaw*, 239 Mich App 161, 180; 607 NW2d 408 (1999). Although the case worker acknowledged that respondent had bonded with the child during the three months he regularly visited the child, respondent had not seen the child since July 1998, eight months before the termination hearing, and there was no evidence that he had maintained contact with the child or attempted to plan for the child during his incarceration. Aside from regularly visiting the child for a few months, respondent failed to comply with the parent/agency agreement before he was incarcerated. Under the circumstances of this case, we conclude that the trial court did not clearly err in finding that it was in the child's best interests to terminate respondent's parental rights.

Affirmed.

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra

/s/ Donald E. Holbrook, Jr.

/s/ Brian K. Zahra