

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of DEMARCO KNOWLEDGE
WRIGHT, Minor.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

CARL E. GODBEE,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

July 1, 2008

No. 281896

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 90-283829-NA

Before: Meter, P.J., and Smolenski and Servitto, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

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

Respondent obtained custody of the infant minor child after completing substance abuse treatment, parenting classes, and other services ordered in a 2002 to 2003 child protective proceeding, but he relapsed into crack cocaine use in October 2004. The minor child came to the attention of protective services and was removed from respondent's care in October 2006. The conditions leading to adjudication were respondent's relapse into cocaine use and lack of housing, which led to his inability to provide proper care for the child.

Respondent argues on appeal that he should have been allowed additional time to rectify the conditions leading to adjudication. Although petitioner requested termination of respondent's parental rights within 90 days of the initial disposition, more than 182 days elapsed between the initial disposition and the termination hearing. In addition, respondent had been provided services for the same conditions during the earlier proceeding. Respondent did complete inpatient substance abuse treatment and parenting classes, but his behavior toward caseworkers, the results of the Clinic for Child Study, his move out of state and failure to provide an address, and his failure to submit random drug screens and participate in counseling to address both substance abuse and other mental health issues clearly evidenced the fact that he had not made sufficient progress to properly care for the minor child. Given the prior child protective proceeding and respondent's lack of benefit during this one-year proceeding, the trial

court did not clearly err in finding that statutory grounds to terminate respondent's parental rights were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989).

Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent's parental rights was against the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). The five years of the minor child's life were fraught with instability and exposure to drug use, and his lack of hygiene, grooming, and social skills upon removal were outward manifestations of his neglect. Respondent lacked a stable home and was unable to properly care for the minor child. The minor child was receiving proper care and necessary psychological services in the care of his half-sister, who desired to adopt him.

Affirmed.

/s/ Patrick M. Meter
/s/ Michael R. Smolenski
/s/ Deborah A. Servitto