

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of CURTIS CRENSHAW, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner - Appellee,

v

NAOMI CRENSHAW,

Respondent - Appellant,

and

CURTIS CRENSHAW,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

October 24, 2000

No. 224777

Kent Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 98-001068-NA

Before: Fitzgerald, P.J., and Hood and McDonald, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

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

Review of the record reveals that respondent was involved in an abusive relationship with her husband, the minor child's father. Respondent left the abusive relationship and took the child to shelters on nine different occasions. Additionally, respondent was diagnosed with schizophrenia, paranoid type, in partial remission, and prominent dependent personality traits. While respondent had complied with the majority of the parent/agency agreement, treating staff concluded that, even with medication, respondent could not care for the child and was displacing her paranoia upon her child. Respondent would follow the child to school and tell him that he was being "picked" on by peers, although school officials opined that the child was establishing healthy peer relationships. When the child was removed from respondent's custody and placed in foster care, the child began to flourish in his new environment. Respondent returned to old habits and established a relationship with her husband, the child's father.

Approximately one month prior to the termination hearing, respondent was abused by her husband. Finally, respondent's parental rights were terminated to four other children in 1987.

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*, 462 Mich 341, 352; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). There was no evidence that respondent could provide proper care and custody within a reasonable period of time considering the age of the child. Termination was required unless the court found that termination was clearly not in the child's best interests. *Id.* at 364-365. On this record, we cannot conclude that termination was clearly not in the child's best interests. Accordingly, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the child.

Affirmed.

/s/ E. Thomas Fitzgerald

/s/ Harold Hood

/s/ Gary R. McDonald