

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of JAMES MARTIN CONLIN II,
Minor.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

MARJORIE CONLIN,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

September 15, 2009

No. 291274

Ingham Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 08-000634-NA

Before: Murphy, P.J., and Meter and Beckering, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from a circuit court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (c)(ii), (g), and (j). We affirm. This appeal has been decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

Initially, although respondent argues that the circuit court clearly erred in finding that §§ 19b(3)(c)(i), (c)(ii), and (g) were all established by clear and convincing evidence, she fails to address the circuit court's reliance on § 19b(3)(j) as an additional ground for termination. Where a respondent does not challenge a trial court's determination with respect to one or more of several statutory grounds, this Court may assume that the trial court did not clearly err in finding that the unchallenged ground was proven by clear and convincing evidence. See *In re JS & SM*, 231 Mich App 92, 98-99; 585 NW2d 326 (1998), overruled in part on other grounds by *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 353; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Further, a respondent's failure to address an issue that must necessarily be reached to reverse the trial court precludes appellate relief. See *City of Riverview v Sibley Limestone*, 270 Mich App 627, 638; 716 NW2d 615 (2006).

Regardless, the circuit court did not clearly err in finding that each of the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(G); *In re Trejo*, *supra* at 355, 357. The child came into care because respondent was homeless and had no source of income. There was additional information that respondent had a substance abuse problem and limited cognitive ability. Respondent did not comply with drug screens, which affected her ability to exercise visitation, did not attend the Families in Transition program for parenting instruction and counseling, and never obtained stable, independent housing or a job. She then left the state to give birth to another child and never returned.

Further, considering respondent's limitations and her failure to make any effort to develop adequate parenting skills, the circuit court did not clearly err in finding that termination of respondent's parental rights was in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, *supra* at 356-357. Although respondent asserts that it is not in the child's best interests to be separated from his sibling, the record shows that the child had never met his sibling, who was in foster care in another state. Thus, there is no merit to this argument.

Affirmed.

/s/ William B. Murphy

/s/ Patrick M. Meter

/s/ Jane M. Beckering