

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of ALEXANDER JAMES
WESTCOTT and MICHAELA LOUISA
MILLIGAN, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

BILLIE JOE WESTCOTT,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

April 22, 2004

No. 252348

Van Buren Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 02-013675

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

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent Westcott appeals as of right from a circuit court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(g) and (j). We affirm.

Respondent does not challenge the trial court's findings regarding the statutory grounds for termination or the best interests of the children and we find no clear error with respect to the court's findings, which were amply supported by the evidence. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Respondent's sole claim is that petitioner failed to offer sufficient services to facilitate reunification. We disagree.

If a child becomes a court ward due to neglect, the agency must prepare a case service plan before an order of disposition is entered. MCL 712A.18f(2). The service plan must include a schedule of services to be provided to the parent, child, and foster parent to facilitate the child's return to his or her home or to facilitate the child's permanent placement. MCL 712A.18f(3)(d). The record showed that respondent was offered numerous services to prevent the children from becoming court wards but failed to benefit from them. After the children came under the jurisdiction of the court, the FIA arranged for additional services from several providers. Respondent participated in some, such as parenting classes and two counseling sessions, and failed to avail herself of others such as anger management and budgeting classes and the services offered through the Supported Employment Program and the various shelters in which respondent occasionally resided. Still other services through the Samaritan Center, Work First, Project Find, and Family Links could never be implemented or were interrupted because respondent moved frequently among three different counties, abandoned attempts at

reunification, even leaving the state for a time, and failed to maintain contact with her caseworker after returning to Michigan. Respondent's claim that she was not offered sufficient services by petitioner to facilitate reunification with the children is without merit.

Affirmed.

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