

**Court of Appeals, State of Michigan**

**ORDER**

In re MacArthur Minors

Docket No. 281032

LC No. 06-000248-NA

Richard A. Bandstra  
Presiding Judge

E. Thomas Fitzgerald

Jane E. Markey  
Judges

---

The Court orders that the motion for reconsideration is GRANTED, and this Court's opinion issued April, 24, 2008 is hereby VACATED. A new opinion is attached to this order.



---

Presiding Judge



A true copy entered and certified by Sandra Schultz Mengel, Chief Clerk, on

**JUN 19 2008**

Date



---

Chief Clerk

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of CHAYANNE NICOLE  
MACARTHUR and CHRISTOPHER ROY  
MACARTHUR, Minors.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

ANGELIQUE HANKINSON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

CLIFFORD MACARTHUR,

Respondent.

---

UNPUBLISHED

April 24, 2008

No. 281032

St. Clair Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 06-000248-NA

Before: Bandstra, P.J., and Fitzgerald and Markey, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent Hankinson appeals as of right from a circuit court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

Respondent first argues that the trial court erred in finding clear and convincing evidence to terminate her parental rights under §§ 19b(3)(g) and (j). Because only one statutory ground for termination need be proven by clear and convincing evidence, *In re Archer*, 277 Mich App 71, 73; 744 NW2d 1 (2007); *In re Powers*, 244 Mich App 111, 118; 624 NW2d 472 (2000), and because respondent does not address the merits of the trial court's determination that termination was also appropriate under § 19b(3)(c)(i), appellate relief is not warranted with respect to the issue whether a statutory ground for termination was sufficiently established. *People v Kent*, 194 Mich App 206, 210; 486 NW2d 110 (1992) (an issue is deemed abandoned where it is not addressed on appeal); *Roberts & Son Contracting, Inc v North Oakland Dev Corp*, 163 Mich App 109, 113; 413 NW2d 744 (1987) (failure to address a necessary issue precludes appellate relief).

Further, the trial court's findings regarding the children's best interests are not clearly erroneous. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). The evidence showed that the children were subjected to unstable living conditions and were often left in the care of others. Even assuming that they had developed some bond with their parents through regular visitation, the evidence showed that they did not do well in their parents' care. They were not supervised properly and were exposed to domestic violence between the parents as well as inappropriate sexual activity between others. Both children were abnormally aggressive. The older child had other problems as well, which necessitated counseling, and only subsided after visitation had terminated. In fact, she expressed a desire to "forget about" her parents. Thus, the evidence did not clearly show that termination of respondent's parental rights was not in the children's best interests. *In re Trejo, supra* at 354.

Affirmed.

/s/ Richard A. Bandstra  
/s/ E. Thomas Fitzgerald  
/s/ Jane E. Markey