

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of ALISHA SPIGHT, Minor.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

EDDIE LAMONT SPIGHT, JR.,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

LATOYA RENEE COSSE,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

April 6, 2006

No. 264650

Muskegon Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 04-032707-NA

Before: Neff, P.J., and Saad and Bandstra, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the order terminating his parental rights to the minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(g), (h), and (n)(i). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in determining that at least one statutory ground for termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights had been established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 355; 612 NW2d 407 (2000); *In re Sours*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999).

Testimony revealed that respondent-appellant had been incarcerated most of the young child's life, had not provided for the child's needs, financial or otherwise, and would not be able to provide for her needs in the immediate future. Respondent-appellant argues that the trial court erred in failing to take into account the fact that his family stepped forward to help with the child. However, respondent-appellant did not offer a possible family placement for the child until the termination hearing. At that hearing, respondent-appellant's sister testified that she was willing to have the child live with her and her family. But when asked when she came to that decision, she stated, "I just found out about all this in the last couple of days." Simply proposing a relative placement at the last moment is not enough to forestall termination of parental rights. *In re IEM*, 233 Mich App 438, 453-454; 592 NW2d 751 (1999). The evidence supported the

trial court's finding that respondent-appellant had failed to provide proper care and custody for the child in the past and there was no reasonable expectation that he would be able to provide such care within a reasonable time considering the child's age.

Because only one statutory ground needs to be established by clear and convincing evidence, it is not necessary for this Court to consider the other grounds relied upon by the trial court. *In re Powers*, 244 Mich App 111, 118; 624 NW2d 472 (2000).

Furthermore, the evidence does not establish that the child's best interests precluded termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights. MCL 712A.19b(5). Respondent-appellant had no relationship with the child, had been incarcerated for most of her life, and had not provided for her care. The trial court did not clearly err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to the minor child.

Affirmed.

/s/ Janet T. Neff
/s/ Henry William Saad
/s/ Richard A. Bandstra