

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of MICHAEL STRIBLING, Minor.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

WILLIAM M. STRIBLING,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED  
November 25, 2008

No. 285433  
Macomb Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 2007-000253-NA

---

In the Matter of JESSE STRIBLING, Minor.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

WILLIAM M. STRIBLING,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

No. 285434  
Macomb Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 2007-000254-NA

---

In the Matter of DANIEL STRIBLING, Minor.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

WILLIAM M. STRIBLING,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

No. 285435  
Macomb Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 2007-000255-NA

In the Matter of STEVEN STRIBLING, Minor.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

WILLIAM M. STRIBLING,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

No. 285436  
Macomb Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 2007-000256-NA

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

MEMORANDUM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondent appeals as of right from a circuit court order terminating his parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(a)(ii), (c)(i), (c)(ii), (g), and (j). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that §§ 19b(3)(a)(ii), (c)(ii), (g), and (j) were each established by clear and convincing evidence.<sup>1</sup> *In re Archer*, 277 Mich App 71, 73; 744 NW2d 1 (2007). Respondent had a substance abuse problem and other issues that affected his parenting. He made minimal efforts to participate in services and rarely visited the children. After testing positive for cocaine, respondent abandoned the service plan altogether and never visited the children again.

Further, the evidence did not clearly show that termination of respondent's parental rights was not in the children's best interests. *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 354; 612 NW2d 407 (2000); MCL 712A.19b(5).<sup>2</sup> Therefore, the court did not clearly err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the children. *In re Trejo, supra* at 356-357.

Affirmed.

/s/ William B. Murphy  
/s/ David H. Sawyer  
/s/ Michael R. Smolenski

---

<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, any error in relying on § 19b(3)(c)(i) as an additional statutory ground for termination was harmless. *In re Powers Minors*, 244 Mich App 111, 118; 624 NW2d 472 (2000).

<sup>2</sup> Pursuant to an amendment of MCL 712A.19b(5) by the Legislature in 2008 PA 199, a trial court must now find, in addition to a statutory ground for termination, "that termination of parental rights is in the child's best interests." This amendment was made effective July 11, 2008, which is after the date of termination in the case at bar.