

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of JA'VIER DE'RECO  
SINGLETON, DEISHA BREANNA KENYATTA  
SINGLETON, KENYATTA LAMARA  
JEFFERSON, HASAN ABDUL JEFFERSON, and  
JALA UNIQUE JEFFERSON, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,  
  
Petitioner-Appellee,

UNPUBLISHED  
August 28, 2003

v

DARRIN TAYLOR,

Respondent-Appellant,

No. 245751  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 01-399683

and

LADRENA CHERIE SINGLETON, a/k/a  
LADRENA CHRIE SINGLETON, RONALD  
ANTHONY JONES, and KENYATTA OMAR  
JEFFERSON,

Respondents.

---

Before: Markey, P.J., and Cavanagh and Saad, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent Darrin Taylor appeals as of right the order terminating his parental rights as to Deisha Breanna Kenyatta Singleton. We affirm. Neither the mother nor the fathers of the other children are involved in this appeal.

Under MCL 712A.19b(3), the petitioner for the termination of parental rights bears the burden of proving at least one ground for termination. *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341; 617 NW2d 407 (2000). Once the petitioner has presented clear and convincing evidence that persuades the court that a ground for termination is established, termination of parental rights is

mandatory unless the court finds that termination is clearly not in the child's best interests. *Id.*, 355-356. Decisions terminating parental rights are reviewed for clear error. *Id.*, 356.

The petition alleged that respondent failed to rectify conditions that brought the child within the court's jurisdiction, failed to provide proper care and custody, and his imprisonment deprived the child of a home for over two years. MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(ii), (g), and (h). Respondent does not argue that the statutory grounds for termination were not proven. Respondent asserts that termination was not in the child's best interest because, with reasonable efforts, he could be reunified with the child. Respondent failed to offer evidence in support of this assertion. There is no indication that the child is bonded with respondent, or that she would benefit from a continuing relationship with him. Respondent never objected to the agency's lack of efforts to reunify him with his child, and respondent's imprisonment precluded his involvement in the plan for the child. The court did not clearly err in finding that there was no evidence that termination of parental rights was contrary to the best interests of the child. *Trejo, supra*, 356-357.

Affirmed.

/s/ Jane E. Markey  
/s/ Mark J. Cavanagh  
/s/ Henry William Saad