

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of SOLIEL AMEERA WILLIAMS,
Minor.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

WENDY LEE WHALIN-HICKSON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

ANTOINE DEVAUGHN WILLIAMS,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

March 13, 2008

No. 279733

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 02-405669-NA

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

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the order terminating her parental rights to the minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E). For the reasons set forth in this opinion, we affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence or that the child's best interests did not preclude termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 353, 355; 612 NW2d 407 (2000); MCR 3.977(J).¹

¹ The trial court also found statutory grounds for termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights to an older sister of the minor child, but the court determined that termination was not in that child's best interests. Thus, this appeal concerns only Soliel.

The conditions that led to adjudication were environmental neglect and improper supervision, and respondent-appellant was ordered to attend parenting classes and individual therapy to address these conditions. Testimony revealed that respondent-appellant was twice referred to parenting classes and counseling, but she did not participate. Respondent-appellant and the children never attended family counseling because respondent-appellant was inappropriate at visits, particularly failing to interact with Soliel, who suffered from selective mutism. Although respondent-appellant expressed an interest in planning for Soliel, she failed to attend a team decision meeting regarding the child's placement in a new foster home. Respondent-appellant also did not address her own mental health issues. She had been diagnosed with bipolar disorder, but testified at trial that she had last been treated for the condition in 2004 and even then did not take the prescribed medication. Despite respondent-appellant's testimony that she was doing "fine" without the medication, she admitted that she had panic attacks. Respondent-appellant acknowledged that she had not been in a position to care for her children during the previous two years, and the caseworker opined that respondent-appellant would not be in a position to care for the children for at least another year, if ever.

We therefore affirm the decision of the trial court in this matter.

Affirmed.

/s/ Peter D. O'Connell
/s/ Stephen L. Borrello
/s/ Elizabeth L. Gleicher