

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of MAREONNA COREY AALIAH  
WEEMS, Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

ANITRIA LAVONNE WEEMS,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED  
December 18, 2003

No. 245513  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 97-359488

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

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(g) and (i). We affirm. This case is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E)(1)(b).

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I);<sup>1</sup> *In re Sours*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). It was undisputed that respondent-appellant's parental rights to three older children had been terminated in January 2000. A fourth child of respondent-appellant's was a temporary court ward at the time of Mareonna's birth as a result of respondent-appellant's substance abuse. Mareonna tested positive for marijuana at birth. Although respondent-appellant submitted two negative drug screens after Mareonna's birth, she did not submit drug screens weekly as required. Respondent-appellant also failed to obtain independent housing and did not consistently cooperate with in-home services implemented to address her substance abuse problem, improve her parenting

---

<sup>1</sup> Effective May 1, 2003, the court rules governing proceedings regarding juveniles were amended and moved to the new MCR subchapter 3.900. In this opinion, we refer to the rules in effect at the time of the order terminating parental rights. See *In re JK*, 468 Mich 202, 209 n 17; 661 NW2d 216 (2003).

skills, and provide psychological counseling. Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant parental rights was clearly not in the best interests of the child, who was removed from respondent-appellant shortly after birth. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

Respondent-appellant has abandoned her claim that she received ineffective assistance of counsel at trial by failing to include it in her statement of questions presented. *In re BKD*, 246 Mich App 212, 218; 631 NW2d 353 (2001). In any event, respondent-appellant has failed to establish that the alleged errors of counsel fell below an objective standard of reasonableness. *People v Pickens*, 446 Mich 298, 302-303; 521 NW2d 797 (1994). Respondent-appellant argues that counsel's examination of the witnesses was not sufficiently thorough. This is an issue of trial strategy, which we will not second guess on appeal. *People v Davis*, 250 Mich App 357, 368; 649 NW2d 94 (2002).

Affirmed.

/s/ E. Thomas Fitzgerald

/s/ Janet T. Neff

/s/ Helene N. White