

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of BRYNNA ROHR, Minor.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

KIMBERLY ROHR,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

JOHN ROHR, JR.,

Respondent.

---

In the Matter of JAY LAWRENCE ROHR II,  
Minor.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

KIMBERLY ROHR,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

JOHN ROHR, JR.,

Respondent.

---

UNPUBLISHED  
November 16, 2006

No. 270942  
Kent Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 06-050990-NA

No. 270943  
Kent Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 06-050988-NA

Before: Fort Hood, P.J., and Murray and Donofrio, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the trial court's order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(i). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory ground was established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 355; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). There was clear and convincing evidence that respondent-appellant's parental rights to an older daughter were previously terminated due to her failure to protect the daughter from sexual abuse. The record also demonstrated that prior attempts to rehabilitate respondent-appellant had been unsuccessful. The evidence demonstrated that respondent-appellant had not been rehabilitated so as to protect her younger children from the person who abused her daughter.

Although the trial court found that it was in the children's best interests to terminate respondent-appellant's parental rights, it was only required to find that termination was not clearly against the children's best interests, in accord with MCL 712A.19b(5). Respondent-appellant argues that the trial court erred in terminating her parental rights because she is bonded with her children. However, testimony revealed that respondent-appellant was bonded with her daughter, but not her son, and she refused to get him help for his medical condition. Testimony also revealed that respondent-appellant allowed the children to visit their father, whose parental rights to them had been terminated and who had been convicted of criminal sexual conduct. Thus, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was clearly contrary to the minor children's best interests.

Affirmed.

/s/ Karen M. Fort Hood  
/s/ Christopher M. Murray  
/s/ Pat M. Donofrio