

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of D.J., Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

MONICA JENKINS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

DAVID JENKINS,

Respondent.

In the Matter of H.J., Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

MONICA JENKINS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

DAVID JENKINS,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

July 23, 2002

No. 235891

Mason Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 00-000041-NA

No. 235892

Mason Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 00-000042-NA

In the Matter of S.J., Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

MONICA JENKINS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

DAVID JENKINS,

Respondent.

In the Matter of D.J., Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

DAVID JENKINS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

MONICA JENKINS,

Respondent.

No. 235893
Mason Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 00-000043-NA

No. 235894
Mason Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 00-000041-NA

In the Matter of H.J., Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

DAVID JENKINS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

MONICA JENKINS,

Respondent.

In the Matter of S.J., Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

DAVID JENKINS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

MONICA JENKINS,

Respondent.

Before: Neff, P.J., and White and Owens, JJ.

No. 235895
Mason Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 00-000042-NA

No. 235896
Mason Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 00-000043-NA

MEMORANDUM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondents-appellants appeal as of right from the trial court order terminating their parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii), (b)(i) and (ii), (c), (g), and (j). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that subsections 19b(3)(b)(ii), (c), (g), and (j) were each established by clear and convincing evidence with respect to respondent mother and that subsections 19b(3)(a)(ii), (b)(i), (c), (g), and (j) were established by clear and convincing evidence with respect to respondent father. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Furthermore, the evidence did not show that termination of respondents' parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

Respondent father argues that the trial court erred in refusing to permit him to have visitation with the minor children because respondents' Judgment of Divorce, which was entered in Muskegon County, suspended visitation for respondent father. Counsel for respondent father specifically stated on the record that respondent father should have supervised visitation with the children only after respondent father complied with the requirements of the Judgment of Divorce. Respondent may not harbor error as an appellate parachute by objecting to something on appeal that he or his counsel deemed proper at trial. *Dresselhouse v Chrysler Corp*, 177 Mich App 470, 477; 442 NW2d 705 (1989). Moreover, the trial court did not abuse its discretion by suspending visitation because visitation would have been harmful to the children. MCR 5.965(C)(7).

In sum, the trial court did not err in terminating respondents' parental rights to the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Janet T. Neff
/s/ Helene N. White
/s/ Donald S. Owens