

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

---

In the Matter of R.L., Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

SARAH ACKER,

Respondent-Appellant

and

RANDY LIEFFERS, SR.,

Respondent.

---

UNPUBLISHED

September 17, 2002

No. 239295

Newaygo Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 00-004982-NA

Before: Whitbeck, C.J. and Sawyer and Kelly, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right the trial court's order terminating her parental rights to her minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(j).<sup>1</sup> We affirm.

Respondent first argues that the trial court erred in accepting her plea to the initial petition. Specifically, she claims that the court failed to properly advise her of the consequences of her plea and also failed to ensure that the plea was knowingly and voluntarily given. As a result of these alleged defects, respondent asserts that the court's jurisdiction over the children

---

<sup>1</sup> The trial court's order also terminated the parental rights of respondent Randy Lieffers, Sr. He has not appealed the court's order. The termination petition also listed MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (g) as alternate grounds for termination; however, it appears that the trial court decided this matter solely under MCL 712A.19b(3)(j). Because only one statutory ground is required to terminate parental rights, *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 350; 612 NW2d 407 (2000), we need not decide whether termination of respondent's parental rights was also warranted under §§ 19b(3)(c)(i) or (g).

was not properly established under MCL 712A.2(b)(1). Therefore, respondent argues that the proceedings should be rendered void and the order terminating her parental rights vacated. However, respondent did not timely appeal the trial court's jurisdictional order or otherwise contest its jurisdictional decision through a motion for rehearing below. See *In re Hatcher*, 443 Mich 426, 439; 505 NW2d 834 (1993); *In Re Powers*, 208 Mich App 582, 587-588; 528 NW2d 799 (1995). Consequently, she may not now collaterally challenge the trial court's jurisdiction on appeal.

After reviewing the evidence presented, we find that the trial court did not clearly err in finding that § § 19b(3)(j) was established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Sours*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999). The evidence did not show that termination of respondent's parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5). *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 353-354; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Thus the trial court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights.

Affirmed.

/s/ William C. Whitbeck  
/s/ David H. Sawyer  
/s/ Kirsten Frank Kelly