

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of DCT, BRT and DTT, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

COLITA MARIE TURNER,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

JOSEPH MANDEL BROOKS and
LAMONT RAY,

Respondents.

UNPUBLISHED

January 26, 2001

No. 225822

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 97-349930

Before: Markey, P.J., and Whitbeck and J. L. Martlew*, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the family court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (g); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i) and (g). We affirm. We decide this case without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The family court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence.¹ Termination was proper under subsection (c)(i) because the conditions leading to the adjudication, i.e., respondent-appellant's failure to

¹ MCR 5.974(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989).

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

feed, clothe, house, and care for her children properly, continued to exist more than 182 days later. There was no evidence that she had made significant changes in her life that would allow her to meet her children's needs within a reasonable time considering their ages. For instance, although she obtained housing, respondent-appellant's home was unsuitable for children. She also failed to show that she had improved her parenting skills even though she had attended some parenting classes. There was no substantial compliance with the case service plan, even though she used some services. These factors also supported termination under subsection (g) because they are relevant to respondent-appellant's inability to provide proper care and custody of her children, especially because the children have special needs. Further the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was clearly not in the minor children's best interests.² Thus, the family court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental right to the minor children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Jane E. Markey
/s/ William C. Whitbeck
/s/ Jeffrey L. Martlew

² MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).