

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

UNPUBLISHED  
June 10, 2010

In the Matter of A. K. McQueen, Minor.

No. 295442  
Montcalm Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 09-000396-NA

---

Before: HOEKSTRA, P.J., and MARKEY and DAVIS, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals by right from a circuit court order terminating his parental rights to the minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(l). We affirm.

It was undisputed that respondent's parental rights to another child were previously terminated after the initiation of child protective proceedings under MCL 712A.2(b). Thus, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that § 19b(3)(l) was established by clear and convincing legally admissible evidence. MCR 3.977(E)(3) and (J); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Further, because respondent's parental rights to another child were previously terminated and respondent placed the child at issue here at an unreasonable risk of harm by raising her in a drug house, petitioner was permitted to request termination of respondent's parental rights at the initial dispositional hearing, MCL 722.638(1)(b) and (2), and reasonable efforts to reunify respondent with the child were not required, MCL 712A.19a(2)(c).

Further, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that termination of respondent's parental rights was in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich at 356-357. Respondent's parental rights to his first child were terminated in part because of substance abuse, domestic violence, and financial instability. These circumstances had not changed. Respondent still abused drugs, engaged in domestic violence with the child's mother, and supported the family by selling drugs. Despite a biannual stipend of \$50,000, respondent was unable to maintain stable housing, and the family was living in a motel room that was

littered with evidence of respondent's drug activity. Respondent was unable or unwilling to provide his child with a safe and stable environment. Therefore, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the child.

We affirm.

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra  
/s/ Jane E. Markey  
/s/ Alton T. Davis