

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of RYAN WOODS, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

RASHEED WOODS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

CHARITY WOODS,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

January 29, 2002

No. 234777

Kent Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 99-070501-NA

Before: Sawyer, P.J., and O'Connell and Zahra, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from a trial court order terminating his parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), (h) and (j). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that § 19b(3)(h) was established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Terry*, 240 Mich App 14, 22; 610 NW2d 563 (2000). Because only one statutory ground is required to terminate parental rights, we need not consider whether termination was warranted under the remaining statutory grounds. *In re Huisman*, 230 Mich App 372, 384-385; 584 NW2d 349 (1998). Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

To the extent respondent-appellant challenges the court's exercise of jurisdiction over the minor child, that issue is not properly before this Court on appeal from the termination decision. *In re Hatcher*, 443 Mich 426; 505 NW2d 834 (1993). In any event, the issue is without merit because the child was not placed with relatives prior to petitioner's involvement and the court assumed jurisdiction over the child upon the parents' no contest plea to the amended petition.

We find no merit to respondent-appellant's claim that the trial court's findings of fact were insufficient. See *In re Toler*, 193 Mich App 474, 477; 484 NW2d 672 (1992). The court's findings, although brief, indicate that it was aware of the issues in the case and correctly applied the law, and appellate review would not be facilitated by a remand for further explanation. *Triple E Produce Corp v Mastronardi Produce, Ltd*, 209 Mich App 165, 176; 530 NW2d 772 (1995).

Affirmed.

/s/ David H. Sawyer
/s/ Peter D. O'Connell
/s/ Brian K. Zahra