

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of ROBERT K. CHRISTIANSON,
Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

BRIAN CHRISTIANSON,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED
February 17, 2004

No. 250196
Delta Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 01-000006-NA

Before: Cooper, P.J., and O'Connell and Fort Hood, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from the order of the trial court terminating his parental rights to his minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(g). We affirm. This case is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

Respondent contends that the trial court erred in finding that clear and convincing evidence supported termination of his parental rights. However, we find that considerable evidence existed on the record to support the trial court's decision that respondent had failed to provide proper care for the child. While respondent was still living with the child's mother, the child lived in deplorable conditions. Respondent himself testified that the home and the child were continually dirty and uncared for and that respondent did little to remedy the situation. After separating from the child's mother, respondent had virtually no contact with the child, even after the child was placed with respondent's own parents. Respondent rarely contacted the foster care worker and was reluctant to support the child financially. While testifying at the termination hearing, respondent expressed doubts that the child was his biological son.

Ample evidence also exists on the record to support the trial court's finding that there is no reasonable expectation that respondent would be able to provide proper care for the child in the future. Respondent had obtained employment only the day before the termination hearing and had failed to attend either parenting classes or counseling. He had visited with the child only rarely, and his testimony did not reflect any of the typical parental emotions of love or concern for the child. A review of the record indicates that the trial court did not err in finding that the statutory ground for termination was established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J).

The trial court's statement that termination would also have been appropriate pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(c)(i) does not warrant the reversal of the trial court's order as respondent suggests because there was ample evidence to support at least one statutory ground for termination of respondent's parental rights. Similarly, termination of respondent's parental rights was not contrary to the best interests of the child. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

Affirmed.

/s/ Jessica R. Cooper
/s/ Peter D. O'Connell
/s/ Karen M. Fort Hood