

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of NMA, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

V

LATASHA AMIDON,
a/k/a LATASHA STODDARD,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

December 28, 2001

No. 231722

Oakland Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 99-628256-NA

Before: White, P.J., and Talbot and E.R. Post*, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the family court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (g). We affirm. This case is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

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(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Once there was clear and convincing evidence that at least one statutory ground for termination was established, respondent's liberty interest no longer included the right to custody and control of the child. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 355; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent's parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interest. MCL 712A.19b(5); *Trejo, supra*, at 356-357.

Additionally, although she was represented by several different attorneys during these proceedings, respondent did not receive ineffective assistance of counsel because counsels' performance did not fall below an objective standard of reasonableness under prevailing professional norms and there is not a reasonable probability that but for any alleged error, the result of the proceedings would have been different. *Strickland v Washington*, 466 US 668, 687; 104 S Ct 2052; 80 L Ed 2d 674 (1984); *People v Pickens*, 446 Mich 298; 521 NW2d 797 (1994); *People v Stanaway*, 446 Mich 643, 687-688; 521 NW2d 557 (1994).

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

Finally, respondent claims that instances of prosecutorial misconduct denied her a fair trial. Respondent failed to preserve this issue by not timely and specifically objecting to any alleged instances of prosecutorial misconduct. *People v Kelly*, 231 Mich App 627, 638; 588 NW2d 480 (1998). Because she has failed to show that she was prejudiced by plain error in this regard, reversal is not required on this basis. *People v Carines*, 460 Mich 750, 774; 597 NW2d 130 (1999).

Affirmed.

/s/ Helene N. White
/s/ Michael J. Talbot
/s/ Edward R. Post