

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of AMW, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

CHRISSEY TRUTSCH,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

RICHARD WHEELER,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

March 8, 2002

No. 234822

Kalamazoo Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 98-000201-NA

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

RICHARD WHEELER,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

CHRISSEY TRUTSCH,

Respondent.

No. 234983

Kalamazoo Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 98-000201-NA

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

MEMORANDUM.

Respondents appeal as of right from the trial court's order terminating their parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(g), (i) (concerning respondent-mother only), and (j). We affirm.

On appeal, both respondents argue that there were not sufficient proofs to show by clear and convincing evidence that their parental rights should be terminated. We review a decision to terminate parental rights for clear error. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

With regard to respondent-mother, the record shows that she has visual and severe hearing impairments and that she previously has had her parental rights to another child terminated. Regarding her care of AMW, the record shows that she terminated prenatal care, lacks knowledge about childrearing, lacks stability in housing, and continues a relationship with respondent-father, who has a history of criminal sexual conduct and is a convicted sexual offender. Respondent-mother admits that she became pregnant at a time when there was a court order stating that she should not be around respondent-father.

As to respondent father, he admitted to engaging in a sexual relationship with his younger sister as a juvenile. Further, he has an adult conviction of fourth degree criminal sexual conduct in an unrelated matter and refuses to acknowledge any wrongdoing in this incident. He denies or makes excuses for these incidents and does not admit that he has a problem. Under these circumstances, the trial court did not clearly err in terminating both respondents' parental rights. *Trejo, supra*.

Each respondent presents additional arguments on appeal that were not addressed in their identical statement of question presented and thus are not properly raised on appeal. MCR 7.212(C)(5); *Grand Rapids Employees Independent Union v Grand Rapids*, 235 Mich App 398, 409-410; 597 NW2d 284 (1999). Nonetheless, we have considered those arguments and find each of them to be without merit.

Affirmed.

/s/ Richard Allen Griffin
/s/ Donald E. Holbrook, Jr.
/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra