

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of L. M. B., B. L. D., and F. J. W.,
JR., Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

MARIAN BROWN,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

MICHAEL GRIFFIN, FREDERICK WILLIAMS,
SR., and BRUCE DEKLE,

Respondents.

Before: Bandstra, P.J., and Murphy and Murray, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent Marian Brown appeals as of right the order terminating her parental rights to her three children. We affirm.

A petition for termination of respondent's parental rights was brought on three grounds: failure to rectify conditions leading to the adjudication, MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), failure to provide proper care, MCL 712A.19b(3)(g), and likelihood that the children would be harmed if returned to respondent's home, MCL 712A.19b(3)(j). Respondent pleaded no contest to the allegations, and entered into an agreement pursuant to *In re Adrianson*, 105 Mich App 300; 306 NW2d 487 (1981). A hearing was held ninety days after the plea, and respondent admitted she violated the agreement by using drugs. The court did not find that termination was clearly not in the best interests of the children, and it terminated respondent's parental rights.

Under MCL 712A.19b(3), the petitioner for the termination of parental rights bears the burden of proving at least one ground for termination. *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341; 617 NW2d 407 (2000). Once the petitioner has presented clear and convincing evidence that

UNPUBLISHED

March 1, 2002

No. 235286

Kalamazoo Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 99-000003-NA

persuades the court that a ground for termination is established, termination of parental rights is mandatory unless the court finds that termination is clearly not in the child's best interests. *Id.* at 355-356. Decisions terminating parental rights are reviewed for clear error. *Id.* at 356.

There is no showing that the court clearly erred in finding that termination was not contrary to the children's best interests. Respondent had a long-term drug problem that she could not manage. The court observed that the children needed a permanent parent in their lives. The court allowed respondent to maintain contact with the children after the termination. There is no showing that their best interests were defeated by termination.

Affirmed.

/s/ Richard A. Bandstra
/s/ William B. Murphy
/s/ Christopher M. Murray