

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of MARY VILLENEUVE, a/k/a MARY  
VICTORIA DEERFIELD, and LAURA JEAN  
DEERFIELD, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

LAWRENCE ALLEN DEERFIELD and JEAN  
MARIE VILLENEUVE, a/k/a JEAN MARIE  
DEERFIELD,

Respondents-Appellants.

---

UNPUBLISHED  
October 29, 1999

Nos. 211504; 212232  
217208; 217382  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 80-220630

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

PER CURIAM.

In Docket Nos. 211504 & 212232, respondents appeal as of right from a family court order terminating their parental rights to their daughter Mary under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), (i) and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i), (g), (i) and (j). In Docket Nos. 217208 & 217382, respondents appeal as of right from a family court order terminating their parental rights to their daughter Laura under MCL 712A.19b(3)(g), (i), (j) and (l); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(g), (i), (j) and (l). We affirm.

Docket Nos. 211504 & 212232

The family court did not clearly err in finding that each of the statutory grounds in question, §§ 19b(3)(c)(i), (g), (i) and (j), were established by clear and convincing evidence with respect to respondent Jean Villeneuve. We likewise conclude that the family court did not clearly err in finding that §§ 19b(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j) were established by clear and convincing evidence with respect to respondent Lawrence Deerfield.<sup>1</sup> MCR 5.974; *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989).

Both respondents failed to show that termination of their parental rights was clearly not in Mary's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5); *In re Hall-Smith*, 222 Mich App 470, 472-473; 564 NW2d 156 (1997). Thus, the family court did not err in terminating respondents' parental rights to Mary. *Id.*

Docket Nos. 217208 & 217382

The family court's exercise of jurisdiction over Laura is supported by a preponderance of the evidence. MCR 5.972(C)(1); *In re Brock*, 442 Mich 101, 108-109; 499 NW2d 752 (1993). Hence, the assumption of jurisdiction was proper.

Moreover, the family court did not clearly err in finding that §§ 19b(3)(i), (j) and (l) were established by clear and convincing evidence with respect to each respondent. MCR 5.974; *In re Miller, supra* at 337.

Finally, both respondents failed to show that termination of their parental rights was clearly not in Laura's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5); *In re Hall-Smith, supra* at 472-473. Thus, the family court did not err in terminating respondents' parental rights to Laura. *Id.*

Affirmed.

/s/ Kathleen Jansen  
/s/ Henry William Saad  
/s/ Hilda R. Gage

<sup>1</sup> The record does not indicate that Lawrence Deerfield's parental rights to any other children were terminated previously. Therefore, termination of Lawrence Deerfield's parental rights under § 19b(3)(i) was not warranted by the evidence.