

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of MARK STEVEN VOSBURG,
ALEXIS TABITHA-FLORENCE VOSBURG,
EMILEE ELIZABETH VOSBURG, MICHELLE
MARIE VOSBURG, TONY JAMES VOSBURG,
NICOLE MARIE VOSBURG, VIKKI ANN
VOSBURG, and JESSICA ASHLEY VOSBURG,
Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

ALLEN VOSBURG,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

CHERYL VOSBURG,

Respondent.

In the Matter of MARK STEVEN VOSBURG,
ALEXIS TABITHA-FLORENCE VOSBURG,
EMILEE ELIZABETH VOSBURG, MICHELLE
MARIE VOSBURG, TONY JAMES VOSBURG,
NICOLE MARIE VOSBURG, VIKKI ANN
VOSBURG, and JESSICA ASHLEY VOSBURG,
Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

UNPUBLISHED
December 14, 2001

No. 233647
Van Buren Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 99-012249

No. 233648
Van Buren Circuit Court

CHERYL VOSBURG,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

ALLEN VOSBURG,

Respondent.

Family Division

LC No. 99-012249

Before: Wilder, P.J., and Griffin and Smolenski, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondents appeal as of right from an order terminating their parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(g) and (j). We affirm.

Considering the history of past adjournments and the number of attorneys respondents had retained in the past, we hold that the trial court did not abuse its discretion in denying respondents' motion for an adjournment. *In re Jackson*, 199 Mich App 22, 28; 501 NW2d 182 (1993).

Respondents failure to adequately brief their newly raised evidentiary issue concerning the testimony of foster care supervisor Ann Perry, regarding information in Dr. Schirado's psychological evaluation, could preclude appellate review. *Community Nat'l Bank of Pontiac v Michigan Basic Property Ins Ass'n*, 159 Mich App 510, 520-521; 407 NW2d 31 (1987). Having considered the issue, however, we are not persuaded that respondents have demonstrated a plain foundational error. *In re Snyder*, 223 Mich App 85, 92; 566 NW2d 18 (1997). Furthermore, even if there was error, we are satisfied that it was harmless. MCR 2.613(A). See also MCR 5.901(B)(1) and MCR 5.902(A).

Next, having reviewed both the trial court's oral findings of fact and written findings of law, which referred specifically to MCL 712A.19b(3)(g) and (j), we reject respondents' claim that the court's findings were inadequate. MCL 712A.19b(1); MCR 5.974(G). We further note that, while respondents correctly cite the clearly erroneous standard for this Court's review of a trial court's findings, MCR 5.974(I), because respondents have failed to brief the question whether the trial court clearly erred in finding that §§ 19b(3)(g) and (j) were both proven, we deem this question abandoned. *In re JS & SM*, 231 Mich App 92, 98; 585 NW2d 326 (1998), overruled on other grounds by *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 353; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

Finally, the record does not show that termination of respondents' parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, *supra*.

Affirmed.

/s/ Kurtis T. Wilder
/s/ Richard Allen Griffin
/s/ Michael R. Smolenski