## STATE OF MICHIGAN COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of ALLEN LEE KIRKPATRICK, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

 $\mathbf{v}$ 

ROBERT LEACH and KIMBERLY LEACH,

Respondents-Appellants.

In the Matter of ROBERT LEE KIRKPATRICK, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

V

ROBERT LEACH and KIMBERLY LEACH,

Respondents-Appellants.

In the Matter of CHARLOTTE LEE LEACH, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

UNPUBLISHED July 24, 2001

No. 231053 Delta Circuit Court Family Division LC No. 00-004723-NA

No. 231054 Delta Circuit Court Family Division LC No. 00-004724-NA

No. 231055

## ROBERT LEACH and KIMBERLY LEACH,

Delta Circuit Court Family Division LC No. 00-004819-NA

Respondents-Appellants.

In the Matter of PERCY LEE LEACH, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

V

ROBERT LEACH and KIMBERLY LEACH,

Respondents-Appellants.

No. 231056 Delta Circuit Court Family Division LC No. 00-005120-NA

Before: Wilder, P.J., and Hood and Griffin, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondents appeal as of right from a family court order terminating their parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(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 introduced at the trial on the issue of jurisdiction. MCR 5.974(D) and (I); *In re Sours*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Further, considered as a whole, the evidence did not show that termination of respondents' parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 354; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

Respondents' claim that the family court erred by not adjourning the dispositional hearing is not properly before this Court because it lacks citation to supporting authority. *In re Toler*, 193 Mich App 474, 477; 484 NW2d 672 (1992). Regardless, we are satisfied from our review of

the record that the family court did not abuse its discretion in denying respondents' motion to adjourn. *In re Jackson*, 199 Mich App 22, 28; 501 NW2d 182 (1993).

Affirmed.

/s/ Kurtis T. Wilder

/s/ Harold Hood

/s/ Richard Allen Griffin