

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

UNPUBLISHED
August 28, 2012

In the Matter of KIECA, Minors.

No. 307194
Oakland Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 11-782768-NA

Before: O'CONNELL, P.J., and JANSEN and RIORDAN, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondent mother appeals from the family court's order terminating her parental rights to her two minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii), (f), and (g). We affirm.

On appeal, respondent's sole challenge is to the family court's initial exercise of jurisdiction. The family court took jurisdiction over the children after jury verdicts in the adjudication phase against respondent with regard to each child, and separate verdicts against the father with regard to each child. Respondent now argues that the evidence was insufficient to support the verdicts against her. We decline to address this argument, because the family court's jurisdiction was properly founded on the alternate basis of the verdicts against the father, who has not appealed.

When a family court acquires jurisdiction over children as a result of one parent's conduct, the court may proceed with a termination action against the other parent. *In re CR*, 250 Mich App 185, 200-203; 646 NW2d 506 (2002); see also MCR 3.973(A). Consequently, once the family court established proper jurisdiction over the children in this case on the basis of the father's conduct, the court could proceed with dispositional matters involving respondent. See *In re LE*, 278 Mich App 1, 17; 747 NW2d 883 (2008).

The dissent concludes—*sua sponte*—that the evidence of the father's conduct was insufficient to support the jury's verdicts against him. We question the advisability of assailing a jury's verdicts without ever being requested to do so, of possibly reviving the father's claims, and of disrupting the permanency planning for these children, all absent full briefing by the parties.

Affirmed.

/s/ Peter D. O'Connell
/s/ Kathleen Jansen