STATE OF MICHIGAN

COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of BRITTANY L. LONGHINI and BRANDON L. LONGHINI, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

CHARLENE MARIE LITTLE,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

DANNY CHRIS LONGHINI,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED
April 25, 2000

No. 219379
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 97-358015

In the Matter of BRITTANY L. LONGHINI and BRANDON L. LONGHINI, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

DANNY CHRIS LONGHINI,

Respondent-Appellant,

No. 219612
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 97-358015

and

CHARLENE MARIE LITTLE,

Respondent.

Before: Gribbs, P.J., and Hoekstra and Markey, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

In these consolidated cases, appellants appeal by delayed leave granted the family court order terminating their parental rights to their minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i), (g),and (j). We affirm.

Only one statutory ground for termination must be established in order to terminate parental rights. See *In re Huisman*, 230 Mich App 372, 384-385; 584 NW2d 349 (1998). The trial 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); *In re Hall-Smith*, 222 Mich App 470, 472-473; 564 NW2d 156 (1997). Although appellants complied with some of the court's orders for treatment, the evidence revealed that both parents failed to completely resolve their substance abuse problems and criminal justice problems during the nineteen months the children were in foster care. The record shows that both appellants have a long history of substance abuse and a history of doing well for a short period of time, then relapsing. The evidence clearly shows that they could not provide a suitable home for the children at the time of the termination hearing or within a reasonable period of time. Further, appellants failed to show that termination of their parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5); *In re Hall-Smith, supra*. Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating both appellants' parental rights to the children.

We affirm.

/s/ Roman S. Gribbs
/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra
/s/ Jane E. Markey