

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of ANTHONY TUCKER, AARON
TUCKER, and ADAM TUCKER, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

CHARLES TUCKER,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

MARIE TUCKER,

Respondent.

In the Matter of ANTHONY TUCKER, AARON
TUCKER, and ADAM TUCKER, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

MARIE TUCKER,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

CHARLES TUCKER,

UNPUBLISHED
November 28, 2000

No. 218685
Jackson Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 96-019009-NA

No. 218822
Jackson Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 96-019009-NA

Respondent.

Before: Doctoroff, P.J., and Hoekstra and Markey, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondents appeal by right from the family court order terminating their parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), (h) and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i), (g), (h) and (j). We affirm.

The family court did not clearly err in finding that at least one statutory ground for termination was established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 350, 352, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). During the long period of time that the children were in foster care, respondents demonstrated that they could not provide a suitable and stable home for the children. Further, the evidence did not establish that termination of respondents' parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5); *Trejo, supra* at 354. Thus, the family court did not err in terminating respondents' parental rights to the children.

Although respondents claim that they were denied due process because the initial dispositional hearing was not timely held, MCR 5.973(A)(2), they did not raise this issue below, and we are satisfied that the seven-day delay had no affect on the outcome of the case. Therefore, this issue does not warrant appellate relief. *In re Hildebrant*, 216 Mich App 384, 389; 548 NW2d 715 (1996). Further, notice of proceedings involves a personal right and, therefore, respondents lack standing to argue that there was a deficiency in the service with respect to the minor child Aaron. See *In re Terry*, 240 Mich App 14, 21; 610 NW2d 563 (2000).

We affirm.

/s/ Martin M. Doctoroff
/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra
/s/ Jane E. Markey