

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of NEAL COLE and SHEILA  
MARTEEZE COLE, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

CLAUDIA COLE,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED

December 19, 1997

No. 201086

Wayne Juvenile Court

LC No. 92-302174

Before: Griffin, P.J., and Markman and Whitbeck, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from the juvenile court's amended order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (g); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i) and (g). We affirm.

The juvenile court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989); *In re Hall-Smith*, 222 Mich App 470, 471-473; 564 NW2d 156 (1997). The conditions that caused the court to assume jurisdiction in this case continued to exist at the time of the termination hearing. When the children were removed from respondent's care, she lacked the skills to provide even the most basic child care, such as providing daily feedings. While respondent was never trained in how to care for children or even herself, there was little likelihood that she could learn to independently care for the children within a reasonable amount of time even with intensive training. She required at least a couple of years of intensive training to learn to provide even the most basic care. Furthermore, even if respondent received training in child care, she lacked the necessary personality traits to properly care for children, such as empathy, nurturing qualities, and sensitivity to children's needs. There was no evidence that these problems could be rectified with training.

The juvenile court's decision to terminate respondent's rights under either §§ 3(c)(i) or (g) was supported by clear and convincing evidence and termination of respondent's rights was in the children's best interests. Respondent has therefore not shown that she was denied due process of law in light of the evidence of long-term neglect of the children that supported the juvenile court's decision to terminate respondent's rights. *Fritts v Krugh*, 354 Mich 97, 116; 92 NW2d 604 (1958), overruled in part on other grounds in *In re Hatcher*, 443 Mich 426, 440-444; 505 NW2d 834 (1993).

Affirmed.

/s/ Richard Allen Griffin

/s/ Stephen J. Markman

/s/ William C. Whitbeck