

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of KELLY JOANN GRIMMETT,
CHELSEA ANN MARIE GRIMMETT, SHANE
MICHAEL GUIFFRE, and EIAN ANDERSON,
Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

UNPUBLISHED
September 23, 2004

v

No. 254421
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 00-392702

DIANE LEE GRIMMETT,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

MICHAEL GUIFFREE, ALQUINN
MERRIWEATHER, and CHRISTOPHER
ANDERSON,

Respondents.

Before: Donofrio, P.J., and White and Talbot, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals by delayed leave granted the order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that a statutory ground for termination was established by clear and convincing evidence. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Even assuming that respondent's home was not unsuitable by the time of the termination trial, respondent-appellant failed to fully comply with the requirements of her court-ordered treatment plan. Although respondent-appellant completed parenting classes and a Clinic for Child Study, she failed to regularly attend the visits with her children, complete counseling, and maintain employment and income throughout the proceedings. In addition, despite the court's evident concern throughout the proceedings about whether respondent-appellant was abusing drugs, respondent-appellant only sporadically provided the ordered drug screens and failed to attend a substance abuse assessment.

Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo, supra* at 354. We are not convinced that the trial court clearly erred in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights.

Respondent-appellant also suggests on appeal that petitioner did not adequately assist her towards reunification because there was a lack of continuity in the caseworkers assigned to her case. Although testimony indicated that at least three different caseworkers were assigned to respondent-appellant's case throughout the proceedings, there is no indication in the record that petitioner failed to make reasonable efforts towards reunification. To the contrary, respondent-appellant was assigned the same supervisor throughout the proceedings and respondent-appellant knew that she could contact the supervisor if she needed to. Furthermore, petitioner made numerous referrals for services. Therefore, we find that the record does not support respondent-appellant's argument.

Affirmed.

/s/ Pat M. Donofrio
/s/ Helene N. White
/s/ Michael J. Talbot