

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of LASHEA CHELSEA MERC
MYRICK and JAWUAN HUMBLE, Minors.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

GWENDOLYN MARIE HUMBLE,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

JERRY MYRICK,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

January 29, 2008

No. 278309

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 04-427355-NA

Before: Beckering, P.J., and Sawyer and Fort Hood, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent Gwendolyn Marie Humble appeals as of right from the trial court's order terminating her parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

Although respondent argues that the trial court erred in terminating her parental rights under § 19b(3)(c)(i), she does not challenge the trial court's reliance on §§ 19b(3)(g) and (j) as additional grounds for termination. Because a trial court's termination decision need be supported by only a single statutory ground for termination, *In re McIntyre*, 192 Mich App 47, 50; 480 NW2d 293 (1991), respondent's failure to challenge the trial court's reliance on §§ 19b(3)(g) and (j) precludes appellate relief with respect to this issue. In any event, 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 Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). The evidence showed that despite years of services, which included substance abuse treatment and therapy, respondent still had not resolved her substance abuse problem. Further, she remained dependent on others, including her adult daughter, for housing and money, and her situation continued to expose the

children to her former boyfriend, who had sexually abused one of the children. The evidence supported termination of respondent's parental rights under §§ 19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j).

Finally, the evidence did not clearly show that termination of respondent's parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5), *In re Trejo, supra* at 354-357. Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Jane M. Beckering

/s/ David H. Sawyer

/s/ Karen M. Fort Hood