

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of DA'GEENEA SUE MARIE LEE,
Minor.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

DANA C. LEE,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

June 3, 2008

No. 281804

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 05-443446-NA

Before: Davis, P.J., and Murray and Beckering, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from the order terminating her parental rights to her minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm. This appeal has been decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The trial court did not clearly err in finding the statutory grounds for termination established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 353; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Although provided with numerous services, respondent did little to rectify the conditions that brought the child into care. She finished parenting classes and one substance abuse program, but continued to use alcohol and marijuana, to miss visitations and drug screens, and to have unstable housing and income. She did not comply with counseling and was repeatedly jailed during the pendency of the case. She also did not complete a substance abuse assessment and was discharged for failure to comply with several programs. The child was in foster care for two years and respondent was given repeated chances to improve, yet respondent's pattern of behavior demonstrated little likelihood that she would be able to provide proper care or custody within a reasonable time. The child would definitely continue to be at risk with a parent who abused alcohol and marijuana, lacked suitable housing and income, and was unavailable for long periods because she was in jail. Ample evidence supported termination of her parental rights under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j).

We further find no clear error in the trial court's ruling concerning the best interests of the child. MCL 712A.19b(5); *Trejo*, *supra* at 356-357. While respondent and the child were bonded, respondent's attendance at visitations was inconsistent, and she was unable to overcome the problems that brought the child into care. The child needs a permanent, safe, stable home,

which respondent cannot provide. Termination of respondent's parental rights was not clearly contrary to the child's best interests.

Affirmed.

/s/ Alton T. Davis

/s/ Christopher M. Murray

/s/ Jane M. Beckering