

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

---

In the Matter of CHRISTIAN JAMES CHASTINE,  
Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,  
  
Petitioner-Appellee,

v

DENISE K. DUNCAN,  
  
Respondent-Appellant,

and

CHRISTOPHER CHASTINE,  
  
Respondent.

---

UNPUBLISHED  
November 21, 2000

No. 224177  
Ingham Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 00-035600-NA

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

PER CURIAM.

Respondent-appellant appeals by right from the juvenile court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(g); MSA 27A.3178(598.19b)(3)(g). We affirm.

We find from a review of the record that the trial court did not clearly err in finding that the above-referenced subsection was established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Vasquez*, 199 Mich App 44, 51; 501 NW2d 231 (1993). The record shows that respondent has a history of substance abuse problems and criminal activity. At age 11 she began using marijuana, by age 16 she used alcohol, and by age 20 she was addicted to snorting cocaine. She has over a ten-year history of committing felonies, and she engaged in criminal activities such as shoplifting to support her habit. Although she had a six-year plus period of sobriety, she returned to using cocaine, this time crack cocaine, and resumed criminal activities to obtain money for her drug habit. As a result of her activities, she has spent time in jail on multiple occasions and was incarcerated at the time of the permanent wardship hearing. She used cocaine

while pregnant and both she and the child tested positive for cocaine at the time of the child's birth. Respondent has not followed through with the court orders regarding, among other things, obtaining substance abuse treatment, counseling, and parenting classes, submitting to urinalysis, notifying if she is arrested, and contacting the case worker weekly. Nor has she maintained contact with the case worker in an effort to reunify with her child.

Under these circumstances, we cannot conclude that the court clearly erred in terminating respondent's parental rights. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). To the extent respondent argues that the court failed to disclose specific findings of fact to support its conclusions of law, her argument is not supported by the record.

Respondent also argues that she was denied due process where the process used to terminate her parental rights was unfair due to state inaction, counsel inaction and court error. We find none of respondent's due process arguments supported by the record.

Affirmed.

/s/ Martin M. Doctoroff  
/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra  
/s/ Jane E. Markey