

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

No. 6-398 / 06-0595

Filed July 12, 2006

**IN THE INTEREST OF M.T., M.T., and T.B.,
Minor Children,**

**D.R.B.T., Mother,
Appellant.**

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Woodbury County, Mary L. Timko,
Associate Juvenile Judge.

A mother appeals from the trial court's order terminating her parental
rights. **AFFIRMED.**

H. Allan Sturgeon, Sioux City, for appellant.

Thomas J. Miller, Attorney General, Kathrine S. Miller-Todd, Assistant
Attorney General, Thomas S. Mullin, County Attorney, and David Dawson,
Assistant County Attorney, for appellee.

Molly Vakulskas Joly of Vakulskas Law Firm, P.C., Sioux City, for father.

Martha McMinn, Sioux City, for intervenor.

Michelle Driebelbis, Juvenile Law Center, Sioux City, guardian ad litem for
minor children.

Considered by Mahan, P.J., and Hecht and Eisenhauer, JJ.

EISENHAUER, J.

A mother appeals the termination of her parental rights to her children. The children were removed from their mother's care in August 2003 and have since remained in foster care. Parental rights were terminated pursuant to Iowa Code sections 232.116(1)(b), (d), (e), (f), (i), and (l) (2005). She contends the State failed to prove the grounds for termination pursuant to sections 232.116(1)(b), (d), (f) and (l) by clear and convincing evidence.¹ She makes no argument with respect to the propriety of terminating her parental rights under sections 232.116(1)(e) and (i). Failure to argue an issue may be deemed to be a waiver of the issue. *In re J.J.A.*, 580 N.W.2d 731, 740 (Iowa 1998). The mother's failure to raise any arguments regarding sections 232.116(1)(e) and (i) means she has waived these issues, and we may affirm the termination of her parental rights under these sections. *In re R.R.K.*, 544 N.W.2d 274, 276 (Iowa Ct. App. 1995) (holding termination need only be found proper under one ground to affirm).

AFFIRMED.

¹ The mother argues the State failed to prove abandonment under section 232.116(1)(d). She also argues the State failed to prove the children cannot be returned to her care under the meaning of section 232.116(1). We interpret this to refer to section 232.116(1)(f). She argues the State failed to prove she was offered services to correct the circumstances that led to adjudication and that those circumstances continue to exist despite the receipt of services. Although she cites to section 232.116(1)(c), it appears she is instead arguing against termination pursuant to section 232.116(1)(d). Finally, the mother claims termination was not appropriate under sections 232.116(1)(k), which appears to refer to termination under section 232.116(1)(l).