

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of REHAIM DEMONTAE
MATTHEW MILLER, Minor.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

EFFIEYA NANCE,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

DESHON MILLER,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

September 29, 2009

No. 291351

Genesee Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 00-112984-NA

Before: Murphy, P.J., and Meter and Beckering, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent Effieya Nance appeals as of right from a trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (c)(ii), (g), (j), and (m). We affirm.

Initially, although respondent argues that the trial court clearly erred in finding that §§ 19b(3)(c)(i), (c)(ii), (g), and (j) were all established by clear and convincing evidence, she fails to address the trial court's reliance on § 19b(3)(m) as an additional ground for termination. A respondent's failure to brief or address an issue that must necessarily be reached to reverse the trial court precludes appellate relief. *City of Riverview v Sibley Limestone*, 270 Mich App 627, 638; 716 NW2d 615 (2006).

Regardless, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that §§ 19b(3)(c)(i), (g), (j), and (m) were each proven by clear and convincing evidence. MCL 712A.19b(3); MCR 3.977(J); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 355-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). The child's two siblings came into care in 2005, in part because respondent was using marijuana. Respondent failed to comply with services and, when faced with a supplemental petition for termination in 2007, she released her parental rights to the siblings. Respondent thereafter failed to comply with services offered

to promote reunification with her younger child and continued to use marijuana despite participation in substance abuse treatment. When the trial court deferred ruling to give respondent another chance to prove that she was serious about reunification, she dropped out of her treatment program. Additionally, for these same reasons and the reasons cited by the trial court in its ruling, the court did not clearly err in finding that termination was in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo, supra* at 356-357. In sum, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the child.

Affirmed.

/s/ William B. Murphy

/s/ Patrick M. Meter

/s/ Jane M. Beckering