

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of MATINA NEWSON, MAURICE  
NEWSON, JR., JOHNESHA LEEANN CURRY,  
and JOHN CAESER CURRY II, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner - Appellee,

v

MAZENA BELL, a/k/a MAZENA NEWSON,

Respondent - Appellant,

and

MAURICE NEWSON,

Respondent,

and

JOHN CURRY,

Respondent.

---

UNPUBLISHED

September 15, 2000

No. 225517

Saginaw Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 98-025454-NA

Before: Talbot, P.J., and Hood and Gage, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from an order terminating her parental rights to her minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (g); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i) and (g). We affirm.

Review of the record reveals that respondent has a history of criminal behavior for retail fraud as well as a history of selecting abusive relationships. Respondent exposed her children to her poor lifestyle choices by including them in the shoplifting crimes by having them wear merchandise. She also suffered abuse at the hands of her live-in boyfriend while the children were in the home. The children were given psychological examinations, and it was concluded that they suffered from the trauma of being exposed to respondent's poor choices. The children were removed from the home shortly after respondent's live-in boyfriend was severely beaten at respondent's behest by her ex-husband. She was suspected of attempted homicide and was jailed for a few months then released. While released, respondent failed to take advantage of every opportunity to attend recommended counseling and parenting classes. Respondent was then sentenced to prison for violation of probation. Her earliest release date is October 1, 2001.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. *In re Trejo*, \_\_\_ Mich \_\_\_; \_\_\_ NW2d \_\_\_ (Docket No. 112528, issued 7/5/2000), slip op. p 17. There was no evidence that respondent could provide proper care and custody within a reasonable period of time considering the age of the children. Termination was required unless the court found that termination was clearly not in the children's best interests. *Id.* at 27. On this record, we cannot conclude that the termination was clearly not in the children's best interests. Accordingly, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the children. *Id.*

Affirmed.

/s/ Michael J. Talbot  
/s/ Harold Hood  
/s/ Hilda R. Gage