

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of MARCUS D'JUAN MILES, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

CHARISMA MILES,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

ISAAC ANDREWS,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

December 11, 1998

No. 206455

Wayne Juvenile Court

LC No. 96-339649

Before: Sawyer, P.J., and Wahls and Hoekstra, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from a juvenile court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i) and (j). We affirm.

The juvenile court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory ground for termination under § 19b(3)(c)(i) was established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). The evidence indicated that respondent-appellant continued to suffer from a mental illness that prevented her from properly caring for her child, that she failed to remain in treatment for that illness, and that she did not consistently remain on her medication. Although there was no direct evidence as to how long respondent-appellant would require treatment, the evidence indicated that it was not reasonably likely that her condition would change within a reasonable period of time, particularly in light of the fact that she made little, if any, progress during the period of

time that she worked with petitioner. Furthermore, only one statutory ground for termination is required. *In re McIntyre*, 192 Mich App 47, 52; 480 NW2d 293 (1991). Respondent-appellant does not address the juvenile court's finding that termination of her parental rights was also warranted under § 19b(3)(j). Therefore, respondent-appellant is not entitled to relief with regard to the issue whether a statutory ground for termination was properly established. *Roberts & Son Contracting, Inc v North Oakland Development Corp*, 163 Mich App 109, 113; 413 NW2d 744 (1987) (failure to address a necessary issue precludes relief).

The possibility of relative care placement, as an alternative to terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights, was not in the minor child's best interests in this case. *In re McIntyre*, 192 Mich App 47, 52; 480 NW2d 293 (1991).

Finally, the record does not support respondent-appellant's claim that petitioner failed to make reasonable efforts to reunite the family. On the contrary, petitioner attempted to address respondent-appellant's medical problems through treatment, but it was respondent-appellant who failed to complete treatment and neglected to attend her appointments. The evidence also showed that respondent-appellant disliked the side effects of her medication and, therefore, did not take it consistently. Further, respondent-appellant was provided with visitation services with her son until the time that he moved to Texas with a relative, with respondent-appellant's consent. Thus, petitioner offered appropriate services and assistance to respondent-appellant and made reasonable efforts to reunite respondent-appellant with her son.

Affirmed.

/s/ David H. Sawyer

/s/ Myron H. Wahls

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra