

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of SARAI MARIE ASHFORD,
Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

KATRINA OLIVER, f/k/a KATRINA MARIE
ASHFORD,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

HAYWARD OLIVER, JR.,

Respondent.

In the Matter of SARAI MARIE ASHFORD,
Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

HAYWARD OLIVER, JR.,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

KATRINA MARIE ASHFORD,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED
February 19, 2004

No. 249804
Macomb Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 01-050421-NA

No. 249907
Macomb Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 01-050421-NA

Before: Neff, P.J., and Wilder and Kelly, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondents appeal as of right from the trial court order terminating their parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm.

In Docket No. 249804, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that §§ 19b(3)(g) and (j) were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Sours*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). The evidence established that respondent Katrina Oliver abandoned Sarai, and respondent's whereabouts were unknown, from December 2001 until June 2001. Although she eventually began working toward completing the parent-agency agreement, respondent never developed insight into Sarai's attachment issues and remained unable to meet Sarai's needs throughout the oft-delayed termination proceedings. Further, in light of the lack of bond between respondent and the child, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent's parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

In Docket No. 249907, we also find that the trial court did not clearly err in determining that §§ 19b(3)(g) and (j) were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *Sours*, *supra* at 633; *Miller*, *supra* at 337. Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent Hayward Oliver, Jr.'s parental rights was clearly not in the best interests of the child. MCL 712A.19b(5); *Trejo*, *supra* at 356-357. The evidence established that respondent had never even seen Sarai and had no relationship with her. Although respondent did comply with some aspects of the parent-agency agreement, he had no insight into Sarai's attachment issues. Moreover, he had four older children who were not in his care but resided with their paternal grandmother under a guardianship.

Affirmed.

/s/ Janet T. Neff
/s/ Kurtis T. Wilder
/s/ Kirsten Frank Kelly