

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of MICHAEL WEEKS, JOSHUA  
SNYDER, ANTHONY SNYDER, ANDREA  
SNYDER, SAMANTHA SNYDER, and  
MATTHEW SNYDER, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,  
  
Petitioner-Appellee,

v

JAMES SNYDER and LACY SNYDER,  
  
Respondents-Appellants.

---

UNPUBLISHED  
April 13, 2004

No. 251442  
Clinton Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 03-016069-NA

Before: O’Connell, P.J., and Jansen and Murray, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondents appeal as of right from the trial court’s order terminating their parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(b)(i), (b)(ii), (b)(iii), (g), (j), and (l). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that §§ 19b(3)(b)(i), (b)(ii), (b)(iii), (g), and (j) were each established by clear and convincing evidence with respect to both respondents. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Sours*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999). The evidence indicated that the children were repeatedly hit with a stick and a belt, and that the paternal grandmother admitted using a yard-long stick to “swat” the children. Respondents also admitted that they taped the children with duct tape to restrain them. The trial court did not clearly err in finding that respondents used discipline that was inappropriate, frequent and excessive.

In addition, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that § 19b(3)(l) was established by clear and convincing evidence with respect to respondent father. As the trial court observed, it was undisputed that respondent father’s parental rights to three older children were previously terminated in 1994. See *In re Snyder*, 223 Mich App 85; 566 NW2d 18 (1997). To the extent the trial court also relied on § 19b(3)(l) as an additional basis for terminating the parental rights of respondent mother, who was not the mother of the children at issue in *Snyder*, *supra*, this error was harmless, given that the court properly found that other grounds for termination existed. *In re Powers*, 244 Mich App 111, 118; 624 NW2d 472 (2000).

Contrary to what respondents argue, the record does not indicate that petitioner failed to offer appropriate services in order to seek reunification. Although petitioner initially contemplated proceeding toward termination without offering services, a treatment plan was subsequently developed and services were provided. It was only after it became apparent that respondents were not benefiting from the services that termination was requested.

Finally, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent father's parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 350; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Although respondent father claims that there were "bonds of love and affection between the parents and the children," the trial court did not clearly err in finding otherwise. *Id.* at 353. Further, the court found that the children "expressed aggressiveness, hatred toward those who abuse[d] them, and . . . are among the most difficult that those in the system have had to work with." The court did not err in terminating respondents' parental rights to the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Peter D. O'Connell  
/s/ Kathleen Jansen  
/s/ Christopher M. Murray