

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of ZONDELL PARRELL
RICHBURG, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

ANNIE JOYCE RICHBURG,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED
September 16, 2003

No. 245001
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 92-297309

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

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals by delayed leave granted from a circuit court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(g) and (i). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

To the extent respondent challenges the trial court's assumption of jurisdiction, we find no basis for relief. Apart from the fact that respondent did not raise this issue in her statement of questions presented as required by MCR 7.212(C), she conceded at the hearing that the evidence was sufficient to establish jurisdiction and thus cannot claim error on appeal. *People v Carter*, 462 Mich 206, 215-216; 612 NW2d 144 (2000); *Living Alternatives for the Developmentally Disabled, Inc v Dep't of Mental Health*, 207 Mich App 482, 484; 525 NW2d 466 (1994).

A court may terminate a parent's rights when at least one statutory ground for termination has been proven by clear and convincing evidence. *In re IEM*, 233 Mich App 438, 450; 592 NW2d 751 (1999). There is no dispute that respondent's parental rights to six other children had been terminated due to serious and chronic neglect. At a minimum, respondent's chronic substance abuse caused her to ignore these children and her duties as a parent. She was offered treatment plans for rehabilitation and reunification but failed to comply with them, apparently unwilling to give up drugs and her destructive lifestyle on the streets. Therefore, we find that the trial court did not clearly err in terminating respondent's parental rights under § 19b(3)(i). We further find that the trial court did not clearly err in determining that evidence did not establish

that termination was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 354; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

Affirmed.

/s/ Michael R. Smolenski

/s/ William B. Murphy

/s/ Kurtis T. Wilder