

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of K.S., R.S., and C.E., Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

REBECCA BURBANK,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

ROBERT SISLER, SR., and DAVID ESPINOSA,

Respondents.

---

In the Matter of K.S., R.S., and C.E., Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

ROBERT SISLER, SR.,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

REBECCA BURBANK and DAVID ESPINOSA,

Respondents.

---

UNPUBLISHED

August 20, 2002

No. 238221

Calhoun Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 00-002970-NA

No. 238223

Calhoun Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 00-002970-NA

Before: Kelly, P.J., and Saad and Smolenski, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondents-appellants appeal as of right from an order terminating their parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm.

Both respondents-appellants argue that the trial court erred in finding clear and convincing evidence of statutory grounds to terminate their parental rights. In order to terminate parental rights, the trial court must find that at least one of the statutory grounds for termination in MCL 712A.19b(3) has been met by clear and convincing evidence. *In re McIntyre*, 192 Mich App 47, 50; 480 NW2d 293 (1993). This Court reviews the trial court's findings of fact under the clearly erroneous standard. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Here, the trial court did not err in finding sufficient evidence to terminate respondents-appellants' parental rights. Petitioner established that both failed to resolve the substance abuse and lifestyle instability issues that prevented them from properly caring for the minor children.

Respondent-appellant Burbank also argues that the trial court erred in denying her counsel's motion for adjournment of the January 26, 2001, hearing. We review a trial court's decision to deny an adjournment for an abuse of discretion. *In re Jackson*, 199 Mich App 22, 28; 501 NW2d 182 (1993). Here, the trial court did not abuse its discretion where Burbank's counsel failed to show good cause for the adjournment. MCR 5.923(G)(2). Burbank's unwillingness to come to court where she might be arrested on an outstanding warrant was not good cause to adjourn.

Affirmed.

/s/ Kirsten Frank Kelly  
/s/ Henry William Saad  
/s/ Michael R. Smolenski