

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In re Elaine Renee Blue, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

APRIL ELAINE BLUE,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

EDGAR SMITH,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

June 23, 2000

No. 219677

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 98-362864

Before: Hoekstra, P.J., and Holbrook, Jr., and Zahra, JJ

PER CURIAM.

Respondent appeals as of right from the order terminating her parental rights. We affirm.

The Family Independence Agency initiated proceedings to terminate respondent's parental rights to her daughter. The evidence produced at the permanent custody hearing showed that respondent, who suffered from a long-term mental illness, lived in a supervised living facility at which her daughter was not allowed to reside. Respondent's prognosis was fair at best, and she would be required to live under supervised conditions for the foreseeable future. The court found that clear and convincing evidence existed to terminate respondent's parental rights under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j), for continuation of conditions of adjudication, failure to provide proper care and custody, and risk of future harm.

To terminate parental rights, the family court must find that at least one of the statutory grounds for termination in MCL 712A.19b; MSA 27.3178(598.19b) has been met by clear and convincing evidence. *In re JS and SM*, 231 Mich App 92, 97; 585 NW2d 326 (1998). If a statutory ground is established, the court must terminate parental rights unless it finds that to do so would not be in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5); *In re Hall-Smith*, 222 Mich App 470, 472; 564 NW2d 156 (1997). We review the family court's findings of fact under the clearly erroneous standard. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989).

The family court did not err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. Respondent, who lost custody of her daughter when she was hospitalized due to her long-standing mental illness, needed continuing treatment for her condition, and was required to reside in a supervised living facility where the child was not allowed. The evidence showed that while respondent had a source of legal income and made attempts to bond with the child during supervised visitation, she would be unable to provide proper care for and custody of the child for the foreseeable future. MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j).

Finally, acknowledging the importance of the child-parent relationship, we nonetheless conclude that the best interests of the child are served by termination of respondent mother's parental rights. *In re Boursaw*, 239 Mich App 161, 180; 607 NW2d 408 (1999), MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5).

Affirmed.

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra
/s/ Donald E. Holbrook, Jr.
/s/ Brian K. Zahra