

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

UNPUBLISHED
January 19, 2012

In the Matter of S. N. WALKER-TIBBS, Minor.

No. 304906
Genesee Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 10-126843-NA

Before: GLEICHER, P.J., and CAVANAGH and O'CONNELL, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals by right the circuit court order terminating his parental rights to the minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii), (c), (g), and (j). We affirm.

At a minimum, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that §§ 19b(3)(a)(ii) and (j) were both established by clear and convincing evidence. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 355-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000); MCR 3.977(H)(3)(a) and (K). The child apparently entered foster care from birth. Respondent had only sporadic contact with the child and last visited her when she was 10 weeks old, which was more than nine months before the termination hearing. He refused to participate in services for reunification and would not cooperate with the caseworkers. Indeed, he demanded that the caseworkers stop contacting him. He failed to appear for the termination hearing, and his whereabouts at that time were unknown. The evidence supported the trial court's determination that termination was warranted under §§ 19b(3)(a)(ii) and (j). Although the trial court cited §§ 19b(3)(c)¹ and (g) as additional grounds for termination, because only one statutory ground for termination need be proven, *In re CR*, 250 Mich App 185, 207; 646 NW2d 506 (2002), it is unnecessary to address whether termination was proper under these additional grounds.

In his discussion of the statutory grounds for termination, respondent also makes passing references to whether he had actual notice of the termination hearing, whether certain evidence was admissible, and whether his attorney was effective. None of these arguments are developed, nor are they included in the statement of questions presented on appeal. We note, however, that the record indicates petitioner and respondent's counsel both made significant efforts to locate

¹ The court did not specify whether it was relying on subsection (i) or subsection (ii) of § 19b(3)(c), or both.

respondent prior to trial, and both were unable to find him. The record also contains a summons and an affidavit concerning service of the summons. The remaining issues are not properly before this Court, and we decline to consider them further. *Mich Farm Bureau v Dep't of Environmental Quality*, 292 Mich App 106, 146; ___ NW2d ___ (Docket No. 290323, issued March 29, 2011).

We also reject respondent's argument that termination of his parental rights was not in the child's best interests. Considering that the child never had an opportunity to establish a bond with respondent and respondent's apparent lack of interest in establishing a relationship with the child, the trial 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).

Affirmed.

/s/ Elizabeth L. Gleicher

/s/ Mark J. Cavanagh

/s/ Peter D. O'Connell