

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of MARCO ORENDAIN, Minor.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

DANIELLE M. GREENE,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

MARCO ORENDAIN,

Respondent.

---

In the Matter of ANTONIO ORENDAIN, Minor.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

DANIELLE M. GREENE,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

MARCO ORENDAIN,

---

UNPUBLISHED  
February 26, 2008

No. 280238  
Kent Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 06-052150-NA

No. 280239  
Kent Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 06-052151-NA

Respondent.

---

Before: Whitbeck, P.J., and Jansen and Davis, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondent Danielle M. Greene challenges an order terminating her parental rights to her twin sons pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm.

The trial court did not err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Respondent admitted that her parental rights to her other three children were terminated in California. She acknowledged a history of mental health problems, which included several hospitalizations as recently as 2006. Respondent was compliant with her parent-agency agreement to the extent that she found safe and suitable housing, remained drug free, and completed parenting classes. However, respondent failed to attend individual therapy after her therapist left on maternity leave. Respondent suffered from a personality disorder and lacked insight into those aberrant personality characteristics. She was not a candidate for medication, and the only way of dealing with her personality disorder, it seemed, was through consistent and intense counseling. Also notable was respondent's apparent lack of insight regarding her mental health. At times she acknowledged that she had mental health issues, but she could not testify about what the issues were or how they should be addressed. She admitted prior hospitalizations but was steadfast in her belief that the hospitalizations were unnecessary. She blamed her mother for involuntary commitments and failed to acknowledge that a problem existed. Respondent's delicate mental health also manifested itself in how she treated her caseworkers. Respondent's continued problems with her mental health supported termination pursuant to subsections 19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j).

Having found the foregoing subsections proven by clear and convincing evidence, the trial court was obligated to terminate respondent's parental rights unless it appeared, on the whole record, that termination was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). The instances that the workers pointed to during respondent's visits with the children – her giving them 100 percent fruit juice and only letting them both out of their car seats and strollers for limited periods of time – were not instances of abuse or neglect. In fact, the workers acknowledged that respondent attended each of her visits and was late only on occasion. Respondent was always happy to see the children and play with them. She brought them appropriate foods and interacted with them well. She would, however, become stressed when one or both boys became upset. Respondent admitted that she was not sure how bonded the children were with her since she only saw them once a week. There was no doubt that respondent loved her children, but she simply was not in a position to care for them due to her unstable mental health. They were entitled to permanence and stability.

Affirmed.

/s/ William C. Whitbeck

/s/ Kathleen Jansen

/s/ Alton T. Davis