

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of ANTHONY MICHAEL
JOHNSON, Minor.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, f/k/a
FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

UNPUBLISHED
June 27, 2006

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

ANDREA K. JOHNSON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

GABRIELLE BRIMM,

Respondent.

No. 267195
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 05-441476-NA

Before: Kelly, P.J., and Markey and Meter, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(g) and (j). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

Initially, we note that respondent-appellant's claim that the trial court abused its discretion in denying respondent-appellant's request for an additional psychological evaluation is supported by insufficient authority and is thus waived for purposes of appeal. See *Wilson v Taylor*, 457 Mich 232, 243; 577 NW2d 100 (1998). Even if we were to address the issue, we would conclude that the trial court was under no obligation to offer respondent-appellant a second evaluation, inasmuch as termination of parental rights at the initial dispositional hearing is authorized under MCL 712A.19b(4). The trial court was simply under no obligation to offer

respondent-appellant another evaluation beyond the evaluation stipulated to at the initial adjudication. While respondent-appellant suggests that the Clinic for Child Study evaluation that was admitted into evidence was improper, respondent-appellant offered no objection below to its admission, and again this issue is waived. See *People v Fetterley*, 229 Mich App 511, 520; 583 NW2d 199 (1998).

Anthony was severely and permanently injured as a result of child abuse when respondent-appellant left him alone with Michael Anthony Clark, who she knew harbored ill feelings toward the baby and who had a criminal history. After Anthony was injured, respondent-appellant delayed getting medical attention for him because she was concerned about herself and whether she would be blamed for his injuries. In addition, respondent-appellant failed to accept any responsibility for the events leading up to the abuse and after the abuse occurred, and she failed to grasp the seriousness of Anthony's problems or his need for ongoing care. Respondent-appellant had no long-term plan for caring for Anthony and his older sister other than being placed into a group home where she could receive help with every aspect of her life. Under the circumstances, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to Anthony.

Affirmed.

/s/ Kirsten Frank Kelly
/s/ Jane E. Markey
/s/ Patrick M. Meter