

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of DONALD RENS, ROBERT RENS
and JOSHUA RENS, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

UNPUBLISHED
November 28, 2000

v

No. 227390
Kent Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 98-001092 NA

TRACIE BYXBE,

Respondent-Appellant,
and

DANIEL ALONZO AND WILLIAM MERRITT,

Respondents.

Before: Smolenski, P.J., and Holbrook, Jr. and Gage, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant, biological mother of the three involved minor children, appeals as of right from the family court's order terminating her parental rights with respect to the children. We affirm.

Our review of the record reveals that the family court did not clearly err in determining that respondent freely and knowingly admitted the supplemental petition's allegations and consented to termination of her parental rights. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Conley*, 216 Mich App 41, 42; 549 NW2d 353 (1996). The termination hearing transcript shows that the family court at length informed respondent of the implications of her concessions, and that respondent voluntarily admitted the allegations and consented to termination. *In re Toler*, 193 Mich App 474, 477; 484 NW2d 672 (1992); *In re Blankenship*, 165 Mich App 706, 712; 418 NW2d 919 (1988). Furthermore, the family court need not have announced a statutory basis for the

termination of respondent's parental rights when respondent consented to the termination.¹ *In re Toler, supra.*

Affirmed.

/s/ Michael R. Smolenski
/s/ Donald E. Holbrook, Jr.
/s/ Hilda R. Gage

¹ In light of our conclusion that the family court properly determined that respondent consented to the termination of her parental rights, analysis of respondent's suggestion that "there was not enough evidence 'clear and convincingly' that her rights should have been terminated," which argument respondent failed to present in her appellate brief's statement of questions presented, *Hilliard v Schmidt*, 231 Mich App 316, 318; 586 NW2d 263 (1998), becomes unnecessary.