

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of SHONTAVEON NICOLE  
MANSON-YETT, Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

LAQUISHA NICOLE MANSON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

AL YETT,

Respondent.

---

UNPUBLISHED

October 21, 2003

No. 244964

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 95-327028

Before: Bandstra, P.J., and Hoekstra and Borrello, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm. This case is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

Respondent-appellant argues that the FIA did not make reasonable efforts to reunite her with her child in violation of MCL 712A.19. We decline to address this issue, as it was not raised below. Regardless, the claim is without merit. In her brief on appeal respondent fails to explain how the record supports this assertion. And to the contrary, the record shows that numerous efforts were made over the almost seven years that this case was pending to resolve the impediments to reunification. Further, respondent was provided extended visitation while the child was in foster care and even had the child returned to her custody at one point

To the extent that respondent-appellant has raised the issue of sufficiency of the evidence, we find that the trial court did not clearly err in finding that at least one statutory ground for termination was established by clear and convincing evidence. *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Respondent-appellant did not have suitable housing or income for most

of the seven-year period of this case, and she had serious mental health issues that she was not working on diligently. The evidence also did not show that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). While there was a strong bond between respondent-appellant and her child, this was not enough to outweigh the factors that made termination appropriate. Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to the child.

Affirmed.

/s/ Richard A. Bandstra

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra

/s/ Stephen L. Borrello