

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of ELISE TALIBAH CHILDERS,
JOSEPH DANIEL CHILDERS, and REBEKAH
ANN CHILDERS, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

MARY LOUISE TITUS CHILDERS,

Respondent,

and

GEORGE JEFFRY CHILDERS,

Respondent-Appellant.

In the Matter of ELISE TALIBAH CHILDERS,
JOSEPH DANIEL CHILDERS, and REBEKAH
ANN CHILDERS, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

MARY LOUISE TITUS CHILDERS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

UNPUBLISHED
July 27, 2001

No. 225903
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 87-265326

No. 225933
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 87-265326

GEORGE JEFFRY CHILDERS,

Respondent.

In the Matter of SARAH MARIE CHILDERS,
CHRISTINA EVE CHILDERS, and GEORGE
PERRY CHILDERS, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

MARY LOUISE TITUS CHILDERS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

GEORGE JEFFRY CHILDERS,

Respondent.

In the Matter of SARAH MARIE CHILDERS,
CHRISTINA EVE CHILDERS, GEORGE PERRY
CHILDERS, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

GEORGE JEFFRY CHILDERS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

MARY LOUISE TITUS CHILDERS,

No. 229409
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 87-265326

No. 229530
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 87-265326

Respondent.

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

MEMORANDUM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondents appeal as of right from the family court orders terminating their parental rights to minors Elise, Rebekah, and Joseph under MCL 712A.19b(3)(b)(i), (b)(ii), (c)(i), and (j), and to minors Sarah, Christina, and George under MCL 712A.19b(3)(b)(i), (b)(ii), (c)(i), (g), (i), (j) and (l). 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 Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Further, 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). Thus, the family court did not err in terminating respondents' parental rights to the children. *Id.*

Affirmed.

/s/ Kurtis T. Wilder

/s/ Harold Hood

/s/ Richard Allen Griffin