

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of M.L.T. and J.L.C., Minor.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

ANNA-MARIE CIPONAER,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED

May 13, 2010

No. 295348

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 08-476279-NA

Before: CAVANAGH, P.J., and O'CONNELL and WILDER, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from an order that terminated her parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), (g), (j), and (k)(i). 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 that the statutory grounds for termination of respondent's parental rights were established by clear and convincing evidence. See *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 355; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). In February 2008, there were allegations that M.L.T.'s father, Shawn Treadwell, abused three-month-old M.L.T. by using a hair dryer on her face and legs. M.L.T. was not immediately removed from respondent's care because none of the abuse allegations involved respondent and she acted appropriately in seeking medical treatment for M.L.T. However, M.L.T. was removed from respondent's care within weeks after it was discovered that she was allowing Treadwell to have contact with the child. His rights were terminated in May 2008, and respondent was required to undergo a psychological evaluation, attend parenting classes, attend individual counseling, secure adequate housing, and secure a legal source of income. Treadwell was to have no contact with M.L.T.

Respondent began working on her service agreement in earnest starting in November 2008. She completed the psychological evaluation and had missed only one parenting class. She attended individual counseling and was making some progress. She found housing separate from Treadwell and reported that she was working as a waitress. Respondent gave birth to J.L.C. in January 2009. Her treatment plan for J.L.C.'s case was exactly the same. She was in full compliance with her service agreement and was enjoying unsupervised day visits with the children.

However, things simply fell apart in April 2009. Respondent stopped visiting the children, and she lost her housing after the adoption agency that had been paying her rent stopped doing so when she decided not to place J.L.C. up for adoption. She moved to a motel and then ultimately moved in with a friend. The friend's home was appropriate, but respondent's name was not on the lease. Although respondent reported that she was working, she never provided proof of income. She stopped attending counseling, stopped contacting the foster care worker, and was nearly impossible to reach because she changed her number so often. She was pregnant again. Respondent had no stability and was in exactly the same position she had been when the court first became involved in February 2008. M.L.T. had been a temporary ward for 20 months. J.L.C. had been a temporary ward his entire life. The children did not know respondent as their mother. They deserved permanency and stability. For these reasons, the trial court did not err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination of respondent's parental rights had been established and that termination was in the children's best interests.

Affirmed.

/s/ Mark J. Cavanagh  
/s/ Peter D. O'Connell  
/s/ Kurtis T. Wilder