

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of TAMARA STEVENSON and  
WILLIAM STEVENSON, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

JEFFREY STEVENSON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

REBECCA VANZANDT,

Respondent.

---

UNPUBLISHED

June 21, 2005

No. 260191

Calhoun Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 03-001924-NA

Before: O'Connell, P.J., and Schuette and Borrello, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the order of the trial court terminating his parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm. This case is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). The condition that led to adjudication was respondent-appellant's inability to provide proper care for the children. The evidence clearly and convincingly demonstrated that, at the time of termination, respondent-appellant had yet to address his borderline personality disorder. This disorder prevented respondent-appellant from being able to provide a safe and nurturing environment for his children. Respondent-appellant lacked the capacity and motivation to recognize his children's needs and respond to those needs. He was detached from his children and there existed no bond. Further, at the time of termination, respondent-appellant's living arrangements were unstable and his income was not steady.

Additionally, there was no evidence that respondent-appellant would be able to provide proper care and custody of his children within a reasonable time period. All of the mental health

experts consistently testified that respondent-appellant's disorder was ingrained, part of his makeup, and highly resistant to change. The experts testified that it would take years of specialized treatment before respondent-appellant could work through the disorder. Based upon the foregoing, the trial court did not err when it concluded that there existed clear and convincing evidence to support termination pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j).

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 Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to his children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Peter D. O'Connell

/s/ Bill Schuette

/s/ Stephen L. Borrello