

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of LACEY WALKER and LAURA
WALKER, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

LORI LACKO,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

MICHAEL WALKER,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED
November 5, 1999

Nos. 217039; 217090
Mason Circuit Court
Family Division
LC Nos. 98-000012 NA
98-000013 NA

Before: Whitbeck, P.J., and Gribbs and White, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent Lori Lacko appeals as of right from a family court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), and (d); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), and (d). We affirm. We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

Lacko challenges the trial court's initial exercise of jurisdiction in this matter. However, "a . . . court's jurisdiction in parental rights cases can be challenged only on direct appeal, not by a collateral attack." *In re Powers*, 208 Mich App 582, 587; 528 NW2d 799 (1995), citing *In re Hatcher*, 443 Mich 426, 439; 205 NW2d 834 (1993). Because Lacko did not file a direct appeal from the trial court's initial order of disposition after adjudication, she is foreclosed from challenging the trial court's

exercise of jurisdiction in this appeal. Lacko is likewise foreclosed from raising evidentiary challenges stemming from the adjudicatory hearing. *Id.* at 587-588.

We decline to consider Lacko's argument that the trial court's factual findings were clearly erroneous. Lacko specifically failed to present this as an issue on appeal, *Meagher v McNeely & Lincoln, Inc*, 212 Mich App 154, 156; 536 NW2d 851 (1995), and further failed to challenge any of the specific factual findings the trial court put on the record, *In re Hamlet (After Remand)*, 225 Mich App 505, 521; 571 NW2d 750 (1997).

We reject Lacko's contention that the trial court improperly allowed an expert witness to vouch for the credibility of the child witnesses. The record indicates that the trial court simply, and properly, sought the expert's assistance in generally identifying when a child might be engaging in fabrication.

Finally, we find that the trial court followed proper procedures in terminating Lacko's parental rights, comporting with MCR 5.974(E). The trial court clearly stated that it found that the state sustained its burden of proving the statutory grounds for termination by clear and convincing evidence. The typographical errors in the statutory citation within the trial court's opinion and order are easily appreciated and corrected, and do not void the trial court's findings and conclusions.

Affirmed.

/s/ William C. Whitbeck

/s/ Roman S. Gribbs

/s/ Helene N. White