

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of JANE ADERO SILAS, SANENA
JOY SILAS and MICAH KENU KELLER, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

TAHIRAH JOY SILAS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

MICHAEL LEE KELLER, MICHAEL CLAY, and
ALPHONZO DEGRAFFENREID,

Respondents.

UNPUBLISHED
December 8, 2000

No. 221579
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 97-353349

In the Matter of JANE ADERO SILAS, SANENA
JOY SILAS and MICAH KENU KELLER, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

MICHAEL CLAY,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

No. 221841
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 97-353349

TAHIRAH JOY SILAS, MICHAEL LEE KELLER
and ALPHONZO DEGRAFFENREID,

Respondents.

Before: Bandstra, C.J., and Fitzgerald and D. B. Leiber*, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondents-appellants appeal as of right the family court order terminating their parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (c)(ii), (g), (h), and (j); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i), (c)(ii),(g), (h) and (j). We affirm. This case is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

With regard to respondent mother, the record reveals that before the children entered care, respondent left them unattended, inadequately supervised them with resultant harm, and did not consistently maintain suitable housing. Respondent, who was mentally unstable and unemployed, failed to adequately comply with the treatment plan designed to improve her parenting abilities. With regard to respondent father, the record reveals that he did not visit or support the child. The record also reveals that it was unlikely that he would be paroled anytime soon so that he could visit or support the child.

Under these circumstances, the family court did not clearly err in finding that §§ 19b(3)(c)(i), (c)(ii), (g) and (j) were each established by clear and convincing evidence with respect to respondent Tahirah Joy Silas, and that §§ 19b(3)(c)(i), (g) and (h) were each established by clear and convincing evidence with respect to respondent Michael Clay. Further, the evidence did not show that termination of each respondent-appellant's parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

Affirmed.

/s/ Richard A. Bandstra
/s/ E. Thomas Fitzgerald
/s/ Dennis B. Leiber

* Circuit judge, sitting on the Court of Appeals by assignment.