

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of D.I.C., T.D.J., and D.E.J., Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

CATRINA DENNAE JOHNSON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

DONALD E. LAMB and DANIEL CHANDLER,

Respondents.

UNPUBLISHED
September 13, 2002

No. 235155
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 98-367843

In the Matter of D.I.C., Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

DANIEL CHANDLER,

No. 237078
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 98-367843

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

Respondent-Appellant,

and

DONALD E. LAMB and CATRINA DENNAE
JOHNSON,

Respondents.

Before: Meter, P.J., and Saad and R. B. Burns*, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

In Docket No. 235155, respondent Catrina Johnson appeals as of right from the family court order terminating her parental rights to her minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), (g), and (j). In Docket No. 237078, respondent Daniel Johnson appeals as of right from the family court order terminating his parental rights to his minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii), (b)(i), (c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm.

This Court does not consider respondent Johnson's claim that she was not properly notified of the adjudication trial because this claim is an improper collateral attack on the trial court's exercise of jurisdiction. *In re Hatcher*, 443 Mich 426, 444; 505 NW2d 834 (1993); *In re Powers*, 208 Mich App 582, 587-588; 528 NW2d 799 (1995).

Further, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds were established by clear and convincing evidence with respect to respondent Johnson. 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). The evidence also did not show that termination of respondent Johnson's 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). Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent Johnson's parental rights to the children.

With respect to respondent Chandler, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that §§ 19b(3)(b)(i), (g), and (j) were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *Sours, supra*; *Miller, supra*. Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent Chandler's parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *Trejo, supra*. Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent Chandler's parental rights to the child.

Affirmed.

/s/ Patrick M. Meter
/s/ Henry William Saad
/s/ Robert B. Burns