

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of TEZMONE DA'SHUNN ELLIS
and SHIAINE JA'NECIA FLEMISTER, Minors.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

TEQUISHA DIANE ELLIS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

DARRYL WRIGHT,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

May 20, 2008

No. 281454

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 99-384972-NA

Before: Donofrio, P.J., and Sawyer and Murphy, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from the order terminating her parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that clear and convincing evidence supported the statutory grounds for termination. *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 355; 612 NW2d 407 (2000); *In re Sours Minors*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999); MCR 3.977(J).

Respondent challenges only the trial court's findings with regard to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i). Because the trial court's decision to terminate parental rights need be supported by only a single statutory ground, *In re McIntyre*, 192 Mich App 47, 50; 480 NW2d 293 (1991), respondent's failure to challenge all the statutory grounds relied upon by the trial court precludes appellate relief with respect to this issue. Even considering respondent's argument, we find that the trial court did not clearly err in terminating respondent's parental rights under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i). The conditions that led to adjudication were respondent's failure to provide for Tezmone and her failure to protect him from abuse. At the time of the termination hearing, respondent was still not in a position to properly care for her children.

Testimony revealed that she had not addressed her substance abuse problem and did not have suitable housing and employment.

Respondent argues that she was not provided any assistance by petitioner to resolve her housing situation, citing *In re Newman*, 189 Mich App 61; 472 NW2d 38 (1991), to support her proposition that she needed “guidance” with finding housing. However, the foster care specialist testified that respondent was given “Section 8” referrals for housing and was referred to the “Parent Partner” program, which was a transitional program that helped people gain independent housing. Based on such testimony, we find that petitioner made reasonable efforts to help respondent with her housing.

Furthermore, the evidence did not show that the children’s best interests precluded termination of respondent’s parental rights. MCL 712A.19b(5); *Trejo, supra* at 353. Respondent was not able to provide her children with a safe environment after being offered numerous services over a substantial period of time. The children deserved stability and permanence, which respondent could not provide.

Affirmed.

/s/ Pat M. Donofrio

/s/ David H. Sawyer

/s/ William B. Murphy