

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of KEIAMBE DENISE HOPSON,
Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

STANLEY HOPSON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

PAULINE ALFRED-HOPSON,

Respondent.

In the Matter of KEIAMBE DENISE HOPSON,
Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

PAULINE ALFRED-HOPSON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

STANLEY HOPSON,

UNPUBLISHED
July 22, 2003

No. 243952
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 99-379196

No. 244317
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 99-379196

Respondent.

Before: Zahra, P.J., and Talbot and Owens, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondents appeal as of right from the trial court order terminating their parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g) and (j). We affirm. This case is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E)(1)(b).

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I);¹ *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). The conditions that led to adjudication were respondent-father's physical mistreatment of the child and alcohol abuse and respondent-mother's failure to protect her child from the risk of abuse. Respondents refused to participate in and/or benefit from the services offered. As a result, the conditions that led to adjudication continued to exist at the time of termination and there was no reasonable likelihood that the conditions would be rectified within a reasonable time. Moreover, the alcohol abuse, physical mistreatment, minimization of the effects of abuse, and lack of insight into the reasons that brought the child into care precluded respondents from providing proper care and custody of the child. Accordingly, the court did not err in finding that a statutory basis for termination of respondents' parental rights had been established.

Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondents' parental rights was clearly not in the child best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondents' parental rights to their child.

Affirmed.

/s/ Brian K. Zahra
/s/ Michael J. Talbot
/s/ Donald S. Owens

¹ Effective May 1, 2003, the court rules governing proceedings regarding juveniles were amended and moved to the new MCR subchapter 3.900. The provisions on termination of parental rights are now found in MCR 3.977. Specifically, the court rule governing the standard of review is found at MCR 3.977(J). In this opinion, we refer to the rules in effect at the time of the order terminating parental rights.