

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of JESSA YVONNE LINTON,  
Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

AMBER CHRISTIE LINTON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

JEREMY JONES,

Respondent.

---

UNPUBLISHED

March 16, 2004

No. 250647

Ingham Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 00-507271-NA

Before: Jansen, P.J., and Markey and Gage, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals by right from the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(g) and (j). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that § 19b(3)(j) was established by clear and convincing evidence.<sup>1</sup> MCR 3.977(J); *In re Sours*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). The evidence established that the child would likely be emotionally harmed if returned to the home of respondent-appellant in light of respondent-appellant's reaction to the child's allegations that respondent-appellant's live-in boyfriend sexually abused her. Although respondent-appellant believed that the child fabricated the allegation, she still lived with the boyfriend at the time of the termination trial. She did not believe that the boyfriend posed a threat to the child, and she acknowledged that she had called

---

<sup>1</sup> We need not address the trial court's findings with respect to § 19b(3)(g) because only one statutory ground is needed to support termination of parental rights.

the child a liar during supervised parenting time. Given the circumstances, the trial court did not clearly err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights without offering her additional services to reunify the family. Further, there were no violations of respondent-appellant's due process rights because the termination of her parental rights was supported by clear and convincing evidence. *In re JK*, 468 Mich 202, 210; 661 NW2d 216 (2003); *In the Matter of Render*, 145 Mich App 344, 347-348; 377 NW2d 421 (1985).

Finally, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was clearly not in the best interests of the child. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

We affirm.

/s/ Kathleen Jansen  
/s/ Jane E. Markey  
/s/ Hilda R. Gage