STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of DARION QUANTE HARRIS,
Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

ANTOINETTE MARIE HARRIS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

GRANT LOUIS GARDNER,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED
April 24, 1998

No. 205714
Kalamazoo Juvenile Court
LC No. 91-000072-NA

Before: Hoekstra, P.J., and Jansen and Gage, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the juvenile court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(g) and (i); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(g) and (i). We affirm.

The juvenile court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). The court found that respondent-appellant was not in a position to provide a safe and stable home and proper care for the child. There was also evidence that respondent-appellant's parental rights to two other children were terminated and that prior attempts to rehabilitate respondent-appellant were unsuccessful.

Further, respondent-appellant failed to show that termination of her parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. *In re Hall-Smith*, 222 Mich App 470, 472-473; 564 NW2d 156 (1997). Respondent-appellant argues that the court erred in not placing the child with his maternal grandmother. MCL 712A.1(2); MSA 27.3178(598.1)(2) does not require that the court place a child with relatives. If it is in the best interests of the child, the court may properly terminate parental rights instead of placing the child with relatives. *In re McIntyre*, 192 Mich App 47, 52; 480 NW2d 293 (1991).

In the present case, the court was properly concerned about the ability of the child's grandmother to care for him. Evidence was presented that the grandmother's home was in disrepair, that there were domestic violence issues in her home involving her estranged husband, that her adult children had all been incarcerated, and that she had violated a court order in a prior case prohibiting unsupervised visitation between respondent-appellant and another child.

In light of the evidence present, the juvenile court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to the child. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5).

Affirmed.

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra
/s/ Kathleen Jansen
/s/ Hilda R. Gage