

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of ROSEMARY ENNIS,
CHRISTOPHER ENNIS and ELIZABETH ENNIS,
Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

UNPUBLISHED
April 10, 2001

v

SHARON LYNN ENNIS,

Respondent-Appellant,

No. 228753
Genesee Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 91-087429-NA

and

CHARLES ENNIS,

Respondent.

Before: Talbot, P.J., and Sawyer and F.L. Borchard*, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the family court order terminating 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. This case is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The family court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Contrary to respondent-appellant's argument, the evidence established that respondent-appellant's substance abuse was an important contributing factor to her children's problems, and that respondent-appellant failed to address her substance abuse problem as required by the

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

treatment plan. This evidence supports the family court's decision to terminate parental rights under each of the applicable statutory grounds.

Respondent-appellant also argues that termination was improper because the agency who handled her case failed to make sufficient efforts toward reunification. However, respondent-appellant failed to include this issue in her statement of questions presented, and does not cite any authority in support of her argument. Accordingly, she has waived appellate review of this argument. *Caldwell v Chapman*, 240 Mich App 124, 132; 610 NW2d 264 (2000). In any event, we find that this argument lacks both factual and legal merit. Respondent-appellant cannot establish a causal connection between her consistent failure to supply drug screens and Carol Adams' decision to suspend visitation. Moreover, the record indicates that Adams and the other caseworkers made repeated efforts to assist respondent-appellant in meeting the requirements of the treatment plan, but that respondent-appellant failed to avail herself of those efforts.

Respondent-appellant further argues that termination of her parental rights was not in the children's best interests. This issue also is not included in the statement of questions presented and, therefore, is waived. Nonetheless, it is apparent that the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5); *Trejo, supra* at 356-357. Thus, the family court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Michael J. Talbot
/s/ David H. Sawyer
/s/ Fred L. Borchard