

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of ZACHARIEAUS NEAL JEWEL
TEICHMAN, Minor.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

KAREN TEICHMAN,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

TIM TEICHMAN,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

May 20, 2008

No. 280786

Shiawassee Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 97-008137-NA

Before: Donofrio, P.J., and Sawyer and Murphy, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent mother appeals as of right from the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(l). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in its best interests determination. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 353, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). The minor child was removed from respondent mother's care shortly after birth. The testimony established that respondent mother had participated in multiple services in the past without success, including parenting classes and family counseling. The court previously found that respondent mother did not benefit from those services and there was minimal change in her behavior, and her parental rights to two older children were therefore terminated. None of the evidence presented in this matter suggested that respondent mother is now capable of caring for a child.

The testimony indicated that respondent mother suffers from schizoaffective disorder. Following the birth of the child, she displayed various behaviors that caused nursing staff and an evaluating psychologist to become concerned about her ability to care for a newborn. Respondent mother became angry and resisted respondent father's suggestions of psychological or psychiatric care during the pregnancy, although she was having trouble with her mental stability before the birth of the child. Respondent mother also failed to obtain any prenatal care

until nine months into the pregnancy, and respondent father made that appointment. Respondent father questioned her constantly during the pregnancy about prenatal care, and she would tell him every day that she had called the doctor. Her own testimony reflected a troubling lack of awareness of her serious mental condition, as she felt that there was not a problem with her mental state at the hospital and that she was in a suitable condition to take the baby home. Her reported resistance to prenatal care and to psychiatric or psychological care during her pregnancy certainly was not in the best interests of the child and cast serious doubt on her ability to make decisions in the best interests of the child.

This record strongly suggests that respondent mother continues to lack the ability to care for a child. The trial court did not clearly err by finding that termination of her parental rights was not clearly contrary to the best interests of the child. MCL 712A.19b(5).

Affirmed.

/s/ Pat M. Donofrio

/s/ David H. Sawyer

/s/ William B. Murphy