

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of KOBE RAGEN CAMPBELL,
Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

CRANSTON CAMPBELL,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

KELLI STIFFLER,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED
December 14, 2004

No. 254715
Monroe Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 02-016824

Before: Markey, P.J., and Fitzgerald and Owens, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals by delayed leave granted from the trial court order terminating his parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (g). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The trial court did not clearly err in determining that the statutory grounds for termination of parental rights were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). The minor child was removed from his mother at birth after testing positive for cocaine, and her parental rights were terminated at the initial disposition. The conditions leading to adjudication to which respondent-appellant admitted were his financial inability to care for the minor child, a large child support arrearage for another child, and an outstanding felony warrant for his arrest in Illinois. Other conditions of adjudication included respondent-appellant's unstable housing and occasional cocaine use. Respondent-appellant complied with many aspects of his parent/agency agreement. He worked odd jobs, but during the entire course of the proceedings he did not show any intention of obtaining stable employment. He had a room at his mother's home, but the evidence showed that he stayed with others as well, and never established a stable residence. He had not resolved his outstanding felony warrant for several years prior to the child's birth, and it caused him to

lose disability benefits and become ineligible for much needed financial assistance in Michigan. The trial court was correct in finding that there was not clear and convincing evidence that respondent-appellant was still abusing drugs and that his child support arrearage did not warrant termination. However, it was also correct in finding that his lack of stable housing, lack of stable income, and outstanding warrant established the grounds for termination.

Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant'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). The evidence showed that the minor child recognized respondent-appellant and that there was a type of bond, but the evidence did not show that the bond was so strong that termination was clearly contrary to the child's best interests. Although respondent-appellant had a large extended family willing to assist him in parenting the child, the trial court correctly focused on the instability, uncertainty, and impermanence the child would face if respondent-appellant were his primary caretaker and controlled his custody.

Affirmed.

/s/ Jane E. Markey
/s/ E. Thomas Fitzgerald
/s/ Donald S. Owens