

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of M.C.G., Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

TRENA GARRETT,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED

April 15, 2004

No. 249738

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 01-400303

Before: Cavanagh, P.J., and Murphy and Smolenski, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals by right from the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), (g), (j), and (m).<sup>1</sup> We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E)(1)(b).

The trial court did not clearly err when it found that grounds for termination under subsections (c)(i) and (g) were established by clear and convincing evidence. See MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). The primary conditions leading to adjudication were respondent's substance abuse, medical neglect, and dependency. The evidence indicated she remained dependent on others to provide the child's basic needs and neglected her for several days when the child was briefly returned to respondent's custody. Respondent also failed to provide sufficient drug screens. There was no reasonable likelihood that the conditions would be rectified within a reasonable time, considering the child's age. See MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i). There was also no reasonable likelihood that respondent could provide proper care and custody within a reasonable time, considering the child's age. See MCL 712A.19b(3)(g). The trial court therefore did not err when it found statutory grounds for termination, regardless whether alternative statutory grounds it cited were sufficiently established. See *In re Sours Minors*, 459 Mich 624, 640-641; 593 NW2d 520 (1999).

---

<sup>1</sup> The trial court did not specify which subsections applied to respondent and which applied to the unknown father, whose rights were also terminated.

Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent's parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. See MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357, 365; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Although the child bonded with respondent, she spent little time in her custody and required a stable home both because of her age and her medical needs. In sum, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the child.

Affirmed.

/s/ Mark J. Cavanagh  
/s/ William B. Murphy  
/s/ Michael R. Smolenski