

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of IMMANUEL CURTIS  
TILLMAN, Minor.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

MICHELLINE RUCKER,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

CURTIS E. TILLMAN,

Respondent.

---

UNPUBLISHED

December 20, 2007

No. 276941

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 03-425015-NA

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

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from the lower court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), (g), (j) and (k)(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 §§ 19b(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), and (g) were each established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Sours*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999). Although respondent initially complied with her treatment plan after her release from prison and was successful in regaining custody of the child, she eventually became overwhelmed by the responsibility of child care and relapsed into substance abuse. She thereafter left with the child, absconded from her parole, and did not notify petitioner of the child's whereabouts. The child was left with a relative and respondent did not attempt to contact the child for a period of more than eight months. During this period, respondent resumed her criminal activity and relapsed into drug use. She admitted that she had used cocaine for 22 years and had also started using heroin. In light of this evidence, we find no clear err in the trial court's decision to terminate respondent's parental rights under §§ 19b(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), and (g). Because only one statutory ground is needed to support termination of parental rights, it is

unnecessary to determine whether termination was also justified under §§ 19b(3)(j) and (k)(i). *In re Powers*, 244 Mich App 111, 117; 624 NW2d 472 (2000).

Further, we find no clear err in the trial court's best interests decision. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). The child had been in respondent's custody for approximately four months during the preceding 3½ years. During that period, the formerly happy child had developed anger and separation issues, as well as behavioral problems, due to his many placements. Considering the child's need for stability, the evidence did not clearly show that termination of respondent's parental rights was not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo, supra* at 354. Therefore, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the child.

Affirmed.

/s/ Christopher M. Murray

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra

/s/ Kurtis T. Wilder