

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of ALINA MARIA ASKEW, FAITH
CHRISTINA ASKEW, WALTER ASKEW,
JAMES DAWSHAWN ASKEW, and TRE'ONNA
ANGEL ASKEW, Minors.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

ANGELQUE LAWANA ASKEW,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

LARRY CHARLES MOORE, LEONARD
NICKENS, and ANDRE SIMS,

Respondents.

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

PER CURIAM.

Respondent Angelque Lawana Askew claims an appeal the trial court's order terminating her parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm.

There was clear and convincing evidence to support termination of respondent's parental rights. MCR 3.977; *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Respondent has given birth to 11 children. The parental rights to five of those children are at issue in this appeal. Respondent has an 18-year history of drug addiction and a history with protective services that dates back to 1994. Over the past 14 years, there have been several substantiated claims of neglect, and respondent has been offered a plethora of services. The most recent petition was filed after respondent's youngest daughter, who was born with drugs in her system and several birth defects, died within a few days of her birth. Respondent admitted that she had received little prenatal care and had abused drugs during her pregnancy.

UNPUBLISHED

November 13, 2008

No. 284356

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 94-319229-NA

The conditions that caused the children to come into care included neglect and substance abuse. There was sufficient evidence from which the court could conclude that those conditions continued to exist at the time of termination. Respondent did not substantially comply with the services offered. She failed to consistently submit to drug screens, participate in counseling, and visit with her children. Because respondent did not participate in the services offered, or benefit from the services she did attend, the trial court did not err when it concluded that respondent had yet to adequately address her substance abuse issues. Further, at the time of termination, respondent did not have suitable housing and had not provided verification of stable employment.

Further, there was sufficient evidence from which the court could conclude that the conditions that brought the children into care would not be rectified within a reasonable time. At the time of termination, the children had been in care for over two years. Respondent had been in and out of treatment facilities and had relapsed several times. Respondent had not participated in and/or benefited from services offered. Considering these circumstances, there was no evidence that the conditions would be rectified within a reasonable time. Consequently, the trial court did not err when it terminated respondent's parental rights pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j).

Additionally, there was no evidence that, despite statutory grounds for termination, termination of parental rights would not be in the children's best interests. Any bond that existed between respondent and her children was not strong enough to motivate respondent to overcome her drug addiction. Moreover, the evidence clearly demonstrated that the children would be at risk of injury if returned to respondent's care. Respondent was simply in no better position to parent her children than when the children came into care. These five children deserved to have the benefit of a safe, stable, and nurturing environment to facilitate their continued growth and development.

Affirmed.

/s/ Jane M. Beckering
/s/ Stephen L. Borrello
/s/ Alton T. Davis