

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of ERIC BRADFORD, ERICA JANAE  
BRADFORD, SADE BRADFORD, and BABY BOY  
BRADFORD, a/k/a DAYSHAWN HILL  
BRADFORD, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

RUTH BRADFORD, a/k/a RUTH ANN  
BRADFORD,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

ERIC SCAIFE,

Respondent.

---

UNPUBLISHED

December 3, 1999

No. 218036

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 87-264124

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

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the family court order terminating her parental rights to Sade Bradford and Baby Boy Bradford, a/k/a Dayshawn Hill Bradford, under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j). We affirm.

Respondent-appellant contends that she was not afforded a reasonable time to improve the conditions that led to the adjudication regarding her children and that she should have been afforded a better opportunity to obtain the treatment she requires. We disagree. The evidence disclosed that respondent-appellant does not have a mental illness that can be treated with medication; rather, she

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

suffers from mental impairments and limitations that are not reasonably likely to change over time. Although respondent-appellant argues that petitioner failed to produce expert testimony on the issue of her mental health and prognosis, she has not cited any authority in support of her position that such expert testimony was required and, therefore, has waived this issue. *In re King*, 186 Mich App 458, 467; 465 NW2d 1 (1990). Regardless, we note that respondent's psychological evaluations reveal that she functions at the cognitive level of a seven- to eleven-year-old child and cannot parent her children alone. Therefore, the family court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974; *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Further, respondent-appellant failed to show that termination of her parental rights was clearly not in the children'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 respondent-appellant's parental rights to the children. *Id.*

Affirmed.

/s/ Kathleen Jansen

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra

/s/ Jessica R. Cooper