STATE OF MICHIGAN COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of V.B., L.B., and A.B., Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

 \mathbf{v}

LARRY D. BRETTHAUER,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

FRANCES M. BRETTHAUER,

Respondent.

In the Matter of V.B., L.B., and A.B., Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

FRANCES M. BRETTHAUER,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

LARRY D. BRETTHAUER,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED November 19, 2002

No. 238794 Calhoun Circuit Court Family Division LC No. 00-002253-NA

No. 238795 Calhoun Circuit Court Family Division LC No. 00-002253-NA

In the Matter of C.B., Minor.	_
FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,	

Petitioner-Appellee,

 \mathbf{v}

LARRY D. BRETTHAUER and FRANCES MARIE BRETTHAUER,

Respondents-Appellants.

No. 239463 Branch Circuit Court Family Division LC No. 01-002043-NA

Before: Griffin, P.J., and Gage and Meter, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondents-appellants appeal as of right in separate dockets from the Calhoun County family court order terminating their parental rights to the minor children V.B., L.B., and A.B. under MCL 712A.19b(3)(g) and, as to respondent-mother only, MCL 712A.19b(3)(l). Respondents-appellants also appeal as of right from the Branch County family court order terminating their parental rights to the minor child C.B. under MCL 712A.19b(3)(j) and (l). We affirm.

The termination findings were based on chronic deplorable and unstable home conditions; the poor hygiene of at least one minor, A.B.; the explosiveness exhibited by respondent Larry Bretthauer in the presence of the minors and his unstable psychiatric condition, including attempted suicide; respondent Marie Bretthauer's acquiescence to and intimidation by her husband; and lack of appropriate bonding between respondents and the minors.

The family courts did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Further, the evidence did not show that termination of parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Thus the family courts did not err in terminating respondents-appellants' parental rights to all four children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Richard Allen Griffin

/s/ Hilda R. Gage

/s/ Patrick M. Meter