

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of A.R., a Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

EARLANA ROBINSON,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

May 25, 2001

No. 225938

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 98-365603

Before: Doctoroff, P.J., and Saad and Wilder, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent Earlane Robinson¹ appeals as of right from an order of the Wayne Circuit Court, Family Division, terminating her parental rights to her child A.R. (born 11/29/96) pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(g), (i), and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(g), (i) and (j).² We affirm.

We review a family court's decision to terminate parental rights for clear error. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). If a family court determines that the petitioner has proven by clear and convincing evidence one or more statutory grounds for termination, the court must terminate parental rights unless there exists clear evidence, on the whole record, that termination is not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5); *Trejo, supra* at 351-354.

Petitioner argues that the family court clearly erred when it concluded that petitioner had proven at least one statutory ground for termination by clear and convincing evidence. We disagree. Respondent admitted that her parental rights to another child were terminated before the adjudication in this case. This undisputed fact justified termination of respondent's parental

¹ Apparently, respondent married while this case was pending, and her name is now Earlane Williams.

² The court also terminated the parental rights of the child's unidentified father.

rights pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(i); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(i), and termination need be supported by only a single statutory ground. *In re SD*, 236 Mich App 240, 247; 599 NW2d 772 (1999).

We also disagree with respondent's claim that termination was not in the child's best interests. A.R. had been under the guardianship of his maternal great-grandmother since he was a few months old. Respondent visited him occasionally and purchased some necessities for him, but made no substantial efforts to provide for his care or regain custody. In addition, respondent admitted to a history of crack cocaine abuse that started long before A.R. was born and continued until shortly before the trial in this case. These undisputed facts supported the family court's conclusion that there was no clear evidence that termination was not in the child's best interests.

Affirmed.

/s/ Martin M. Doctoroff
/s/ Henry William Saad
/s/ Kurtis T. Wilder