

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of ASHLEY MARLENE HALSEY
and TORY ANN VANAKEN, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

CLARA HALSEY,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

TROY VANAKEN and HARRY PELLGREENE,

Respondents.

UNPUBLISHED

April 19, 2005

No. 258914

Branch Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 03-002633-NA

Before: Kelly, P.J., and Sawyer and Wilder, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (c)(ii), and (g). We affirm.

Although respondent-appellant's statement of the questions involved in her brief on appeal included an issue regarding the sufficiency of the evidence of the statutory grounds for termination, respondent-appellant did not properly present this issue on appeal because she did not argue the merits of this issue in her brief on appeal. *Richmond Twp v Erbes*, 195 Mich App 210; 489 NW2d 504 (1992). Respondent-appellant may not merely announce her position and leave it to this Court to discover and rationalize the basis for her claims. *Wilson v Taylor*, 457 Mich 232, 243; 577 NW2d 100 (1998). Nevertheless, after a review of the record, 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 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). The children were adjudicated court wards because respondent-appellant left them with an unsuitable caregiver. They were removed from respondent-appellant's home and placed in foster care because of her repeated violations of court orders. At the time of the termination trial, there was evidence that respondent-appellant still was not able to protect her

children and make appropriate decisions for them and would require long-term therapy to be able to be an effective parent.

Furthermore, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Although there was evidence that respondent-appellant was making some progress at the time of the termination hearing, the children could wait no longer for a stable home. Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Kirsten Frank Kelly
/s/ David H. Sawyer
/s/ Kurtis T. Wilder