

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of PARIS LATRELLE BREAUN  
JOSEPH, DIMERE NATRELLE SHERON  
JOSEPH, and HEAVENLY JOYELLE YVONNE  
JOSEPH, Minors.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

HEATHER JOSEPH,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED

May 15, 2008

No. 281777

Ingham Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 05-002159-NA

Before: Donofrio, P.J., and Sawyer and Murphy, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from a circuit court 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).

Respondent argues that the trial court erred in finding clear and convincing evidence to terminate her parental rights under §§ 19b(3)(c)(i) and (g). Because only one statutory ground for termination need be proven by clear and convincing evidence, *In re Archer*, 277 Mich App 71, 73; 744 NW2d 1 (2007), and because respondent does not address the merits of the trial court's determination that termination was also appropriate under § 19b(3)(j), appellate relief is not warranted with respect to the issue whether a statutory ground for termination was sufficiently established. *In re JS & SM*, 231 Mich App 92, 98-99; 585 NW2d 326 (1998).

In any event, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that each of the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. *In re Archer*, *supra* at 73. Following entry of the initial dispositional order in November 2005, respondent was provided with numerous services, but did not make significant progress toward reunification until she began family therapy in November 2006. After nine months of family therapy, she had progressed to the point that two children were returned home on a trial basis. Despite receiving assistance from an in-home services worker and continuing with family therapy, respondent was unable to maintain the home or supervise the children, who were removed two weeks later. Although respondent continued to participate in family therapy after the children were removed,

her therapist testified that respondent still had not progressed to the point that she could properly parent the children on a full-time basis, and she did not know if respondent would ever progress to that point.

Further, the trial court's finding regarding the children's best interests was not clearly erroneous. *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 354, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000); MCL 712A.19b(5). Respondent admittedly was not bonded to her daughter and was willing to release her for adoption. Respondent had a strong bond with her sons, who loved her and expressed an interest in returning home, but they were also reluctant to sever ties with their foster parents. The two boys were also under considerable stress from their conflicting loyalties and uncertain future and required a permanent home and the stability that would bring. Although respondent clearly wanted to be a good mother and was able to function as a proper parent for short periods of time with assistance, she was not able to do so on a full-time basis. The trial court did not clearly err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the children. *In re Trejo, supra* at 356-357.

Affirmed.

/s/ Pat M. Donofrio  
/s/ David H. Sawyer  
/s/ William B. Murphy