

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of WILLIAM ROLLAND EVERETT
KOBÉ, III, TIFFIANEY KOBÉ, RANDALL
ALLEN POWELL, JR., and NIKI MARIE KOBÉ,
Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

WILLIAM ROLLAND EVERETT KOBÉ, II,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

BECKY SUE KOBÉ,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

June 22, 2001

No. 231598

Saginaw Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 98-025495-NA

Before: Smolenski, P.J., and McDonald and Jansen, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondent-father appeals as of right from the family court's order terminating his parental rights to the four minor children¹ pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (g). We affirm.

Respondent-father's sole issue on appeal is that there was not clear and convincing evidence presented to support the statutory grounds for termination of his parental rights. The evidence indicated that nearly two years passed from the filing of the initial petition to the entering of the order terminating parental rights. In that time period, respondent-father never had

¹ Respondent-father is the biological father of William, III and Tiffianey, and is the legal, but not biological, father of Randall and Niki.

stable housing, had a very sporadic employment history and was earning only \$200 a month as a disc jockey, and never provided child support. He did not attend parenting classes or counseling, and did not attend some of the review hearings. He had very little contact with the case workers and his visitation was minimal. In fact, respondent-father had no contact with the children from December 1998 until February 2000, and then not again until June and July 2000. During the visitations, there was evidence that Tiffianey was fearful of her father and did not want to be near him. Thus, respondent-father failed to fully comply with the case service plan as ordered by the court.

Under these circumstances, the family court did not clearly err in finding that there was clear and convincing evidence to warrant termination under subsection 19b(3)(c)(i) (conditions leading to the adjudication continue to exist and there is no reasonable likelihood that the conditions would be rectified within a reasonable time) and subsection 19b(3)(g) (parent, without regard to intent, fails to provide proper care or custody and there is no reasonable expectation of the parent doing so within a reasonable time). *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Further, although not addressed by respondent-father, we agree with the family court's ruling that nothing in the record indicated that termination of respondent-father's parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5).

Affirmed.

/s/ Michael R. Smolenski

/s/ Gary R. McDonald

/s/ Kathleen Jansen