

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of M.L.D.H. and F.M.R., Minors.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

SHARON HOBSON,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

November 10, 2009

No. 291809

Oakland Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 08-742770-NA

Before: Stephens, P.J., and Cavanagh and Owens, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from the trial court's orders terminating her parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(b)(ii), (g), and (j). We affirm.

Respondent first argues that termination of her parental rights was improper because clear and convincing evidence to warrant termination was not presented. However, respondent does not further explain the basis of this argument, or cite any factual support for it. It is well established that an appellant may not merely announce a position and leave it to this Court to discover and rationalize the basis for her claims, nor may she give issues cursory treatment with little or no citation of supporting authority. MCR 7.212(C)(7); *McIntosh v McIntosh*, 282 Mich App 471, 485; 768 NW2d 325 (2009). Therefore, we consider this issue abandoned. *Id.* We note, however, that a parent's liberty interest no longer includes the right to custody and control of a child after clear and convincing evidence of a statutory ground for termination is established under MCL 712A.19b(3). *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 355; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Respondent concedes in her brief that her no contest plea was sufficient to establish the requisite statutory ground for termination.

Turning to the children's best interests, considering the evidence of the past services provided to respondent, the circumstances surrounding the physical abuse of the children in respondent's home, resulting in injuries to the children and the death of their younger sibling, and the children's psychological evaluations and respondent's poor prognosis for change, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that termination of respondent's parental rights was in the children's best interests. See MCR 3.977(J); *In re JK*, 468 Mich 202, 209; 661 NW2d 216 (2003). Neither the evidence that respondent participated in parenting and other programs before

the best interests hearing, nor the evidence that one child expressed a desire to live with respondent during the child's psychological evaluation establishes clear error in the trial court's decision. The trial court gave appropriate consideration to the children's need for a stable, safe, and nurturing environment in assessing their best interests.

Affirmed.

/s/ Cynthia Diane Stephens

/s/ Mark J. Cavanagh

/s/ Donald S. Owens