# STATE OF MICHIGAN

# COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of M.C., M.C., M.C. and M.B., Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

IRVIN LEON BROWN,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

MARCIE SHEREL CLEMENTS,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED
October 29, 2002

No. 240654
Genesee Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 00-112375-NA

---

Before: Hoekstra, P.J., and Wilder and Zahra, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent Brown appeals as of right from a trial court order terminating his parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(b)(i), (c)(i), (g), (j), (l) and (n)(i). 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 at least one statutory ground for termination had been proved by clear and convincing evidence. *In re IEM*, 233 Mich App 438, 450; 592 NW2d 751 (1999). The evidence established that respondent's parental rights to two other children had been terminated by the court pursuant to child protection proceedings and therefore, termination was clearly warranted under subsection 19b(3)(l). Respondent claims that section 19b(3)(l) requires that some evidence must show that the children's health, safety or general welfare was at risk; however, he did not brief the merits of this claim or cite any supporting legal authority. Consequently, the issue is abandoned. *Prince v MacDonald*, 237 Mich App 186, 197; 602 NW2d 834 (1999). Also, termination was proper under sections 19b(3)(b)(i), (j) and (n)(i). The evidence showed that respondent, who was convicted of second-degree criminal sexual conduct for sexually abusing an unrelated child, later sexually abused a sibling of the children, yet he denied that the abuse occurred and, according to a psychological

evaluation, he presented "a very significant risk for future sexual abuse of children." Given that evidence, placing the children in respondent's home or even continuing the parent-child relationship with respondent would likely harm the children. Further, the trial court did not clearly err in its determination that the evidence, on the whole record, did not clearly show that termination was clearly not in the children's best interests. *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 354, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000); MCL 712A.19b(5). Therefore, the trial court did not clearly err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the children. *Trejo, supra* at 356-357.

Affirmed.

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra
/s/ Kurtis T. Wilder
/s/ Brian K. Zahra