STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of DEQUEZ DWAYNE RODNEY CLARK and D'QUARIUS D'SHAWN CLARK, Minors.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

RACHAEL RENEE CLARK,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED
March 4, 2008

No. 280471
Muskegon Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 90-017845-NA

Before: Whitbeck, P.J., and Jansen and Davis, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

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

To terminate parental rights, the family court must find that at least one of the statutory grounds for termination in MCL 712A.19b(3) has been established by clear and convincing evidence. *In re Fried*, 266 Mich App 535, 540-541; 702 NW2d 192 (2005). We review the court's findings of fact for clear error. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989).

Respondent has not shown that the family court clearly erred by finding that at least one of the statutory grounds for termination was proven in this case. Respondent admitted that the allegations in the petition were true. We acknowledge respondent's argument that termination was not warranted because she had a valid excuse for not participating in services. However, respondent does not explain how her reason for not participating in services was relevant to the court's finding under § 19b(3)(i) and § 19b(3)(*l*) that her parental rights to other children had been terminated in the past. Only one statutory ground need be proven in order to terminate parental rights. *In re Powers*, 244 Mich App 111, 118; 624 NW2d 472 (2000). The family court did not err by concluding that at least one of the statutory grounds had been established by clear and convincing evidence in this case. *In re Archer*, 277 Mich App 71, 73; 744 NW2d 1 (2007).

Nor did the family court clearly err in reaching its best-interests determination. The petition alleged that "[t]ermination of parental rights is not clearly against the child[ren]'s best interest." Again, respondent admitted that the allegations in the petition were true. Based on the evidence in this case, the family court did not clearly err by finding that termination would not be clearly contrary to the best interests of the children. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 354; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

Affirmed.

/s/ William C. Whitbeck
/s/ Kathleen Jansen
/s/ Alton T. Davis