

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of T.L.Z. and T.L.Z., Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

TAMMY HAWKINS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

TERRY L. ZYLSTRA,

Respondent.

In the Matter of T.L.Z. and T.L.Z., Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

TERRY L. ZYLSTRA,

UNPUBLISHED

October 11, 2002

No. 235621

Ingham Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 00-036636-NA

No. 235960

Ingham Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 00-036636-NA

Before: Cooper, P.J., and Jansen and R. J. Danhof*, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

* Former Court of Appeals judge, sitting on the Court of Appeals by assignment.

In these consolidated appeals, respondent Tammy Hawkins appeals as of right, and respondent Terry Zylstra appeals by delayed leave granted, from the trial court's order terminating their parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (g). We affirm.

The record reveals a history of domestic violence between respondents. Moreover, during the trial, respondents continued to see each other despite court orders to the contrary. Indeed, respondent Hawkins testified that she could not guarantee that she would refuse to see respondent Zylstra in the future. We further note that several of the domestic violence incidents took place with the respondents' minor children present. Respondent Hawkins also admitted that exposure to the domestic violence affected the older children negatively. Consequently, we conclude that the trial 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 because at least one ground for termination was established, the trial court was required to terminate respondents' rights unless it found that termination was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 364-365; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). The trial court's finding regarding the children's best interests was not clearly erroneous. *Trejo, supra*. Accordingly, the trial court did not err in terminating respondents-appellants' parental rights to the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Jessica R. Cooper
/s/ Kathleen Jansen
/s/ Robert J. Danhof