

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

---

In the Matter of TIQUAN HOOD, ANTONIO  
WILLIAMS, and TRAVON MARSHALL, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

NATASHA MARSHALL,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

ANTONIO WILLIAMS and MARVIN MANGLE,

Respondents.

---

UNPUBLISHED

June 2, 2000

No. 223370

Genesee Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 97-109319-NA

Before: Hoekstra, P.J., and Holbrook, Jr., and Zahra, JJ.

**MEMORANDUM.**

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from a family 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-appellant contends that the family court's decision to terminate her parental rights is not supported by clear and convincing evidence. Respondent-appellant's discussion of this issue is deficient because it is not directed at the elements of the applicable statutory grounds for termination. *Goolsby v Detroit*, 419 Mich 651, 655 n 1; 358 NW2d 856 (1984). In any event, having considered respondent-appellant's arguments in light of the statutory requirements, we are not persuaded that respondent-appellant has established any clear error in the family court's decision. MCR 5.974(I); *In*

*re Sours*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989).

We deem respondent-appellant's claim of judicial bias to be abandoned because it is not set forth in the statement of the issue presented and also lacks citation to any supporting authority. *Goolsby, supra* at 655; *Meagher v McNeely & Lincoln, Inc*, 212 Mich App 154, 156; 536 NW2d 851 (1995). Further, respondent-appellant failed to properly preserve this claim by first raising it in the trial court. *Meagher v Wayne State Univ*, 222 Mich App 700, 726; 565 NW2d 401 (1997). Regardless, having considered the family court's challenged remark in the context of the entire record, we are satisfied that respondent-appellant has not shown that the family court was biased. *Cain v Dep't of Corrections*, 451 Mich 470; 548 NW2d 210 (1996); *Meagher, supra* at 726.

Affirmed.

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra

/s/ Donald E. Holbrook, Jr.

/s/ Brian K. Zahra