

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of MERCEDIE HOLCOMB and  
EMERSON HOLCOMB, Minors.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

ANGEL HOLCOMB,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED

October 20, 2009

No. 291001

Clinton Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 07-020200-NA

Before: Davis, P.J., and Whitbeck and Shapiro, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from 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.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). The conditions that led to the children's adjudication were respondent's substance abuse, lack of stable and suitable housing, lack of financial support to properly care for the children, and failure to properly parent. Respondent also had untreated mental health issues. Respondent minimally participated in services and failed to benefit from the services that she did participate in. In addition, she continued to test positive for cocaine and marijuana, including on the day of the termination hearing, and never obtained suitable housing or employment.

Contrary to what respondent argues, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that reasonable efforts were made to reunify the family and avoid termination of parental rights. See *In re LE*, 278 Mich App 1, 18; 747 NW2d 883 (2008); *In re Fried*, 266 Mich App 535, 542-543; 702 NW2d 192 (2005). The evidence showed that petitioner made numerous referrals for services, including therapy, psychological and psychiatric evaluations, drug screens, visitation, and other programs that could have assisted respondent in securing suitable housing and employment. Respondent did not substantially comply with any service or program, and was terminated from most for noncompliance.

Finally, considering that respondent failed to make any progress in addressing the issues that brought the children into care, and the evidence that the children were not bonded with respondent and were traumatized by their experiences while in her care, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that termination of her parental rights was in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

Affirmed.

/s/ Alton T. Davis

/s/ William C. Whitbeck

/s/ Douglas B. Shapiro