

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of KENDRA E. TRAVIER and JOSEPH
C. TRAVIER, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

KENNETH CHARLES TRAVIER,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

CONNIE SUE DEATON and BRIAN KEITH
DEATON,

Respondents.

Before: Gribbs, P.J., and Doctoroff and T.L. Ludington*, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent Travier appeals as of right from a family court order terminating his parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(g), (i) and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(g), (i) and (j). We affirm.

Respondent first contends that the family court clearly erred in finding that he was not Kendra's father. Because respondent does not cite any authority in support of this argument, this issue is not properly before this Court. *Price v Long Realty, Inc.*, 199 Mich App 461, 467; 502 NW2d 337 (1993); *In re Futch*, 144 Mich App 163, 166; 375 NW2d 375 (1984). Regardless, we are satisfied that the family court's finding is not clearly erroneous, given respondent's admission to a Protective

* Circuit judge, sitting on the Court of Appeals by assignment.

Services worker that he was not the child's father and had joined the mother in signing an acknowledgment of parentage only so the child would have a father. Furthermore, any error in this regard was harmless because the court also determined that any parental rights to the child were subject to termination.

Although respondent challenges the family court's decision to terminate his parental rights, he does not address the applicability of § 19b(3)(3)(i), which was one of the statutory grounds relied upon by the trial court. Respondent's failure to address this necessary issue precludes appellate relief with regard to the question whether a statutory ground for termination was properly established. See *Sargent v Browning-Ferris Indus*, 167 Mich App 29, 37; 421 NW2d 563 (1988); *Roberts & Son Contracting, Inc v North Oakland Dev Corp*, 163 Mich App 109, 113; 413 NW2d 744 (1987). In addition, respondent failed to show that termination of his parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5). Therefore, the family court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the children. *In re Hall-Smith*, 222 Mich App 470, 472-473; 564 NW2d 156 (1997).

Affirmed.

/s/ Roman S. Gribbs

/s/ Martin M. Doctoroff

/s/ Thomas L. Ludington