STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of MONIQUE SHAVERS, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

GARAMENIA TUMPKIN and LEON SHAVERS,

Respondents-Appellants.

UNPUBLISHED
December 3, 1999

Nos. 217578;220046
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 94-313273

Before: Jansen, P.J., and Hoekstra and J. R. Cooper*, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondents Leon Shavers (hereinafter "respondent father") and Garamenia Tumpkin (hereinafter "respondent mother") both appeal by delayed leave granted from the trial court's order terminating their parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(g), (i), (j) and (l); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(g), (i), (j) and (l). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the 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, respondents failed to show that termination of their parental rights was clearly not in the child'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 trial court did not err in terminating respondents' parental rights to the child. *Id.*

We reject respondent father's claim that the trial court erred by failing to advise him of his right to counsel. The record indicates that respondent father was advised of his right to an attorney and that an attorney was appointed to represent him. Respondent father did not object to that representation or request another attorney.

* Circuit judge, sitting on the Court of Appeals by assignment.

We similarly reject respondent father's claim that the trial court erred in denying his request for an adjournment. Contrary to what respondent-father asserts, the record does not indicate that he ever requested an adjournment. Moreover, although the trial judge indicated that there would be no adjournment in this matter, neither respondent father nor his attorney objected to this ruling. This claim, which was not raised in and decided by the trial court, is not preserved for appellate review. *Adam v Sylvan Glynn Golf Course*, 197 Mich App 95, 98; 494 NW2d 791 (1992). In any event, there is no indication that respondent father was prejudiced by the trial court's failure to adjourn the termination hearing.

Affirmed.

/s/ Kathleen Jansen
/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra
/s/ Jessica R. Cooper