

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of KE'ASIA STARR SNOW
WILLIAMS, Minor.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

IDA MAY WILLIAMS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

DALE MAURICE JONES,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED
February 11, 2010

No. 292764
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 86-257537

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

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent Ida May Williams appeals as of right the trial court's order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that petitioner established the statutory grounds by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). The conditions leading to adjudication were the fact that respondent allowed a former boyfriend to babysit the minor child, which resulted in the child being molested and contracting gonorrhea, and respondent's medical neglect of the child. Although respondent completed parenting classes and attended individual and family counseling, she continued to have relationships with inappropriate men and deny the relationships. She also exposed the child to her molester on at least two occasions. The case was pending for two years with no real progress, and it was clear from respondent's actions that she continued to have problems putting the child's need to be away from men ahead of her own needs or wants. Further, after two years and financial help from petitioner, respondent still did not have adequate housing. Therefore, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that sections (c)(i), (g), and (j) were established by clear and convincing evidence.

The trial court also did not clearly err in its best interests determination. MCL 712A.19b(5). Although respondent and the child appeared to have a strong bond, the child had not lived with respondent in over two years and had improved in school and behaviorally in that time. Respondent had endangered the child during her few weeks of unsupervised visitation and, therefore, did not make progress in her ability to protect the child from future abuse. Therefore, the trial court did not clearly err in its best interests determination.

Affirmed.

/s/ Jane M. Beckering

/s/ Jane E. Markey

/s/ Stephen L. Borrello