

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of DANIEL JOHNSON, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

PATRICIA JOHNSON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

JEFF JONES,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

January 8, 2004

No. 249167

Kalamazoo Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 02-000163-NA

Before: Donofrio, P.J., and Griffin and Jansen, 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)(a)(ii), (c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm.

Respondent-appellant has abandoned any challenge to the trial court's finding that the statutory grounds were established by failing to argue the issue in her brief. *Yee v Shiawassee Co Bd of Comm'rs*, 251 Mich App 379, 406; 651 NW2d 756 (2002).

Respondent-appellant challenges only the issue of the child's best interests, arguing that the trial court failed to consider the child's best interests in terminating her parental rights. We disagree. The court is not required to affirmatively find that termination is in the child's best interests. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 364, n 19; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). There was a significant amount of evidence regarding the child's best interests at trial. It is apparent from the record that the trial court was cognizant of the issue and considered the best interests evidence in making its findings. Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant parental rights was clearly not in the best interests of the child. MCL 712A.19b(5); *Trejo, supra* at 356-357. The child was removed after respondent-appellant physically abused him and respondent-appellant never acknowledged that her actions were inappropriate. Respondent-appellant did not

participate in services and stated several times that she did not want the child returned to her home. The evidence established that it would be dangerous for the child to be returned to respondent-appellant. Although there was also evidence that the child and respondent-appellant were bonded and that the child had an extreme reaction upon learning that respondent-appellant's parental rights could be terminated, the trial court did not clearly err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights.

Affirmed.

/s/ Pat M. Donofrio
/s/ Richard Allen Griffin
/s/ Kathleen Jansen