

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of TY'VONNA LEA HARRIS, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

DIANNIA HARRIS,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

February 16, 1999

No. 211389

Ingham Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 004059

Before: Murphy, P.J., and MacKenzie and Talbot, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from the juvenile court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), (i), and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i), (g), (i), and (j). We affirm. This case is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

Relying on the waiver of counsel requirements for criminal proceedings set forth in *People v Anderson*, 398 Mich 361; 247 NW2d 857 (1976), respondent contends that reversal is required because the juvenile court did not substantially comply with the requirements for obtaining a valid waiver set forth in *Anderson*. We disagree. In view of the differences in the applicable court rules for securing a waiver of counsel in criminal and child protective proceedings, compare MCR 6.005 and MCR 5.915(B)(1)(c) respectively, we are not convinced that the same standards that govern a waiver of counsel in criminal proceedings apply to child protective proceedings. Moreover, any error in failing to sufficiently advise respondent about the dangers of self-representation was harmless. See *People v Geoghegan*, 456 Mich 945; 576 NW2d 168 (1998).

Next, respondent challenges the termination of her parental rights under § 19b(3)(g) only. Because only one statutory ground is necessary to terminate parental rights and because respondent does not challenge the termination of her parental rights under §§ 19b(3)(c)(i), (i) and (j), she is not

entitled to appellate relief. *Roberts & Son Contracting, Inc v North Oakland Development Corp*,
163 Mich App 109, 113; 413 NW2d 744 (1987).

Affirmed.

/s/ William B. Murphy

/s/ Barbara B. MacKenzie

/s/ Michael J. Talbot