

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of K. E. KING, Minor.

UNPUBLISHED
December 17, 2013

No. 316327
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 10-491783-NA

Before: BOONSTRA, P.J., and DONOFRIO and BECKERING, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondent mother appeals as of right the trial court's order terminating her parental rights to the minor child, "KK," pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(g) (failure to provide proper care or custody), (j) (reasonable likelihood of harm if child is returned to parent), and (m) (parent's rights to another child were voluntarily terminated). Because no reunification efforts were required because petitioner requested the termination of respondent's parental rights at the initial dispositional hearing, we affirm.

Two of respondent's older children, JT and HC-J, became temporary court wards in early 2010 because respondent was involved in an abusive relationship with HC-J's father and had physically abused JT. Respondent gave birth to two other children, NC-J and LK, in May 2010 and May 2011, respectively. Both children were promptly placed in foster care. Throughout the pendency of the proceedings, respondent repeatedly separated from and returned to her abusive partner and never completed domestic violence counseling. She never obtained housing or a legal source of income. Respondent voluntarily relinquished her parental rights to the four children in 2012.

In February 2013, respondent gave birth to KK, the child at issue in this case. Respondent was still homeless, unemployed, and lacked supplies for KK. Petitioner filed a petition to terminate respondent's parental rights to KK at the initial dispositional hearing, which the trial court granted. Respondent now appeals.

Respondent argues that neither § 19b(3)(g) nor § 19b(3)(j) were applicable in this case because the trial court relied entirely on respondent's previous conduct as reflected in the court file, and no services were provided to assist respondent in caring for KK. Respondent challenges only §§ 19b(3)(g) and (j) and makes no argument regarding § 19b(3)(m), on which the trial court also relied. Therefore, respondent has abandoned any argument with respect to the trial court's termination of her parental rights under § 19b(3)(m). This Court considers an issue abandoned on appeal when a party fails to present a meaningful argument with respect to the issue. *Berger*

v Berger, 277 Mich App 700, 712; 747 NW2d 336 (2008). Because only one statutory basis for termination need be established, *In re Ellis*, 294 Mich App 30, 32; 817 NW2d 111 (2011), and respondent does not challenge the termination of her parental rights under § 19b(3)(m), we need not address the other two grounds on which the trial court relied in terminating respondent’s parental rights.

In any event, petitioner was not required to make reasonable efforts to reunify respondent with KK. Generally, “petitioner must make reasonable efforts to rectify conditions, to reunify families, and to avoid termination of parental rights.” *In re LE*, 278 Mich App 1, 18; 747 NW2d 883 (2008). Such reunification efforts, however, are not required “when termination of parental rights is the agency’s goal.” *In re HRC*, 286 Mich App 444, 463; 781 NW2d 105 (2009). The trial court may order termination at the initial dispositional hearing “and additional reunification efforts shall not be ordered if” (1) the petition requests termination of the respondent’s parental rights, (2) the preponderance of the evidence adduced at trial establishes grounds for the assumption of jurisdiction over the child under MCL 712A.2(b), (3) the court finds on the basis of clear and convincing legally admissible evidence introduced at the trial or dispositional hearing that one or more facts alleged in the petition are true and establish a statutory basis for termination under any subsection of § 19b(3) other than § 19b(3)(c), and (4) the court finds by a preponderance of the evidence that termination of parental rights is in the child’s best interests. MCR 3.977(E); *In re Moss*, 301 Mich App 76, 90-91; 836 NW2d 182 (2013).

In this case, termination was the agency’s goal from the outset, and petitioner requested the termination of respondent’s parental rights at the initial dispositional hearing. The trial court found that it had jurisdiction over the child, that §§ 19b(3)(g), (j), and (m) had each been established by clear and convincing evidence, and that termination of respondent’s parental rights was in the child’s best interests. As noted, respondent does not challenge the trial court’s determination regarding § 19b(3)(m). “Therefore, all the requirements of MCR 3.977(D) were met and no reunification efforts were required.” *Id.* at 91-92.

Affirmed.

/s/ Mark T. Boonstra
/s/ Pat M. Donofrio
/s/ Jane M. Beckering