STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of NICKOLAS MICHAEL RODRIGUEZ and ALYSSA RODRIGUEZ, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

LOUIS RODRIGUEZ,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED
October 23, 2003

Nos. 247926
Macomb Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 00-048798-NA

In the Matter of NICKOLAS MICHAEL RODRIGUEZ and ALYSSA MARIE RODRIGUEZ, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

SHERI ANN LEWIS,

Respondent-Appellant.

No. 248319
Macomb Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 00-048798-NA

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

MEMORANDUM.

In these consolidated cases, respondents appeal the trial court's order terminating their parental rights. We affirm. The appeals are being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

After a petition for termination of parental rights was filed, respondents executed releases of their parental rights. On appeal, they assert that the releases were involuntary where the referee failed to inform them that the releases could result in the future termination of parental rights to other children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(m).

MCL 710.29(6) dictates the requirements for the execution of a release of parental rights:

> A release by a parent or a guardian of a child shall not be executed until after the investigation the court considers proper and until after the judge, referee, or other individual authorized in subsection (2) has fully explained to the parent or guardian the legal rights of the parent or guardian and the fact that the parent or guardian by virtue of the release voluntarily relinquishes permanently his or her rights to the child; and, if the child is over 5 years of age, the court has determined that the child is best served by the release.

The referee complied with the statute by explaining to respondents the legal rights they were relinquishing, and the fact that the action was permanent. The record establishes that the release was voluntary. As with a guilty plea, there is no requirement that all collateral consequences of the action be explained in order to show that the action was voluntary. *People v Jahner*, 433 Mich 490, 502-503; 446 NW2d 151 (1989). It is mere speculation that potential future effects would have affected respondents' decisions.

We affirm.

/s/ Richard A. Bandstra
/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra
/s/ Stephen L. Borrello