STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of DARREL DARNEL DOYLE, Minor.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

V

TUWANA D. WILLIAMS,

Respondent,

and

DARREL A. DOYLE,

Respondent-Appellant.

Before: Saad, C.J., and Sawyer and Borrello, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent Darrel Doyle appeals from a circuit court order that terminated his parental rights to the minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), (g), (j), and (k)(i). For the reasons set forth below, we affirm.

Respondent does not dispute that petitioner proved the statutory grounds for termination by clear and convincing evidence. He argues, however, that the trial court erred in finding that termination of his parental rights was in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5).

The evidence showed that respondent made no effort to maintain a relationship with his son. He visited the child only three times, and the last two visits occurred more than a year apart. According to the foster care worker, by the last visit, the child no longer recognized respondent. The trial court did not clearly err in finding that termination of respondent's parental rights was in the child's best interests. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Further, the court was not required to place the child with a guardian or other custodian in lieu of terminating respondent's parental rights. *In re IEM*, 233 Mich App 438, 453; 592 NW2d 751 (1999); *In re McIntyre*, 192 Mich App 47, 52; 480 NW2d 293 (1991).

UNPUBLISHED August 4, 2009

No. 289812 Wayne Circuit Court Family Division LC No. 06-458177-NA Respondent's second stated issue, which concerns the trial court's alleged consideration of evidence offered during closing argument, has been abandoned because respondent does not address this issue in his brief. *Mitcham v Detroit*, 355 Mich 182, 203; 94 NW2d 388 (1959); *People v Harris*, 261 Mich App 44, 50; 680 NW2d 17 (2004).

Affirmed.

/s/ Henry William Saad

/s/ David H. Sawyer

/s/ Stephen L. Borrello