

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter ANGEL MARIE FENNER-BAILEY,
Minor.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

RYAN PATRICK FENNER,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED
December 22, 2005

No. 262738
Eaton Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 04-014918-NA

Before: Owens, P.J., and Saad and Fort Hood, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from the trial court order terminating his parental rights to the child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii), (c)(ii), (g), and (j). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

In March 2003, the child was left in respondent's care after the child's mother was arrested for domestic violence. Protective services officers investigated the child's placement with respondent two days later and found the child sick, filthy, and inappropriately dressed. The child was removed and brought in for a medical examination. She was treated for a double ear infection and an upper respiratory infection. An item lodged in the bottom of her foot was removed. The child was subsequently placed in the court's custody.

Respondent was required to consistently visit the child, participate in parenting classes, participate in a psychological evaluation and follow all recommendations, participate in a substance abuse evaluation and follow all recommendations, provide random drug screens, and secure stable housing and employment. Respondent's compliance with these conditions was minimal. From the time the child was placed in the court's custody to the April 2005 termination hearing, respondent visited the child only twice, both times in June 2004. Respondent failed to show that he participated in and benefited from parenting classes. He failed to provide any screens between September 2004 and February 2005. He was convicted of methamphetamine use and was jailed from February 12 to February 28, 2005. He did not complete a psychological evaluation. He completed a drug evaluation but failed to participate in the recommended counseling. He did not provide evidence of stable housing or employment. There was no

parent-child bond between him and the child. The trial court concluded that the foregoing evidence supported termination of respondent's parental rights under §§ 19b(3)(a)(ii), (c)(ii), (g), and (j).

On appeal, respondent does not challenge termination of his parental rights under §§ 19b(3)(a)(ii) or (j). Only a single statutory ground needs to be proven in order to terminate parental rights. *In re McIntyre*, 192 Mich App 47, 50; 480 NW2d 293 (1991). Since respondent did not challenge termination of his parental rights under §§ 19b(3)(a)(ii) and (j), both grounds provide statutory bases for termination of respondent's parental rights and support the court's ruling. Moreover, the evidence shows that the trial court did not clearly err in finding termination was appropriate under §§19b(3)(c)(ii) and (g). MCR 3.977(G)(3); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent's parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the child.

Affirmed.

/s/ Donald S. Owens
/s/ Henry William Saad
/s/ Karen M. Fort Hood