

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of NICHOLAS NATHANIEL
WOOTEN, KAYLA EMILDA DIANA WOOTEN,
and IEASHA BRITINE WOOTEN, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

TONIA G. WOOTEN,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

June 5, 1998

No. 203975

Ingham Juvenile Court

LC No. 00004322

Before: Wahls, P.J., and Jansen and Gage, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from a juvenile court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j). We affirm.

Respondent's sole argument is that the proofs presented by the petitioner were not clear and convincing as required by MCL 712A.19b(3); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3). However, respondent's discussion of this issue is directed only at § 19b(3)(g). Because only one statutory ground for termination is required, respondent's failure to specifically address §§ 19(b)(3)(c)(i) and (j) precludes relief. See generally *Roberts & Son Contracting, Inc v North Oakland Development Corp*, 163 Mich App 109, 113; 413 NW2d 744 (1987) (failure to address an issue, which necessarily must be reached, precludes appellate relief); cf. *In re Powers*, 208 Mich App 582, 592-593; 528 NW2d 799 (1995). In any event, the juvenile court did not clearly err in finding that all three statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Further, while MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5) is not addressed by respondent, we note that respondent failed to show that termination of her parental rights was clearly not in the

children's best interests. *In re Hall-Smith*, 222 Mich App 470, 472-473; 564 NW2d 156 (1997). Thus, the juvenile court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the children. *Id.*

Affirmed.

/s/ Myron H. Wahls

/s/ Kathleen Jansen

/s/ Hilda R. Gage