

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of RP, AP, BP and FP, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

HASAN PAJAZETOVIC and SADIKA
PAJAZETOVIC,

Respondents-Appellants.

UNPUBLISHED

April 24 2001

No. 228738

Kent Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 97-002523-NA

Before: Hoekstra, P.J., and Whitbeck and Cooper, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondents appeal as of right from the family court order terminating their parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii), (b)(i), (b)(ii), (c)(i), and (g); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(a)(ii), (b)(i), (b)(ii), (c)(i) and (g). We affirm.

We reject respondents' claim that the family court's findings of fact and conclusions of law are inadequate. In a termination proceeding, "[b]rief, definite, and pertinent findings and conclusions on contested matters are sufficient." MCR 5.974(G)(1). Here, the family court's findings of fact and conclusions of law are sufficiently adequate to facilitate our review. *People v Shields*, 200 Mich App 554, 559; 504 NW2d 711 (1993).

Next, we are satisfied that the treatment plan was appropriately designed to help improve respondents' alleged neglectful behavior. *In the Matter of Mason*, 140 Mich App 734, 737; 364 NW2d 301 (1985).

While we agree that alleged sexual abuse was not a basis for the court's initial assumption of jurisdiction, and that the rules of evidence apply when termination is sought on the basis of changed circumstances, MCR 5.974(E)(1); *In re Snyder*, 223 Mich App 85; 566 NW2d 18 (1997), any error in considering legally inadmissible evidence with regard to the issue of sexual abuse was harmless because the court terminated respondents' parental rights for reasons other than sexual abuse and only one statutory ground for termination need be proven. *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 350, 364-365; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). The children were brought

under the court's jurisdiction because of general allegations of neglect and lack of supervision, and the court did not clearly err in finding that the conditions that led to adjudication continued to exist with no reasonable likelihood that they would be rectified within a reasonable time considering the ages of the children. MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i). Further, the court did not clearly err in determining that, without regard to intent, there was clear and convincing evidence that respondents failed to provide proper care or custody of these children and were not reasonably likely to do so within a reasonable period of time. MCL 712A.19b(3)(g); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(g).

Although respondents also assert that the court improperly considered expert testimony on the issue of sexual abuse, respondents do not point to any specific testimony that they allege was improper and they do not specify which expert's testimony they are challenging. A party may not leave it to this Court to discover a factual basis to sustain its claim. *Great Lakes Div of Nat'l Steel Corp v Ecorse*, 227 Mich App 379, 424; 576 NW2d 667 (1998). In any event, as discussed previously, because the court properly terminated respondents' parental rights for reasons other than sexual abuse, any error in this regard would be harmless.

Affirmed.

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra
/s/ William C. Whitbeck
/s/ Jessica R. Cooper