

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of MICHAEL GARRISON, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

SUSAN GARRISON,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED
November 20, 2003

No. 248482
Ionia Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 02-000028-NA

In the Matter of CHRISTOPHER FEDEWA,
Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

SUSAN GARRISON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

JOHN RAY WILES,

Respondent.

No. 248483
Ionia Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 02-000029-NA

Before: Murray, P.J., and Gage and Kelly, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (c)(ii), (g), (j), and (l). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

It was undisputed that respondent-appellant's parental rights to three older children were terminated in 1990. This clear and convincing evidence alone was adequate to support termination under MCL 712A.19b(3)(l). *In re Powers Minors*, 244 Mich App 111, 118; 624 NW2d 472 (2000).

Furthermore, respondent-appellant did not have suitable housing until shortly before the termination hearing and it was unclear from the testimony whether her finances would allow her to maintain this housing, as the record indicates respondent-appellant was unemployed. There was also considerable testimony that respondent-appellant did not have the necessary mental and emotional capacity to parent her children safely. While in her care, one of the children, who was severely disturbed, went to therapy only sporadically. Despite parenting classes, respondent-appellant failed to demonstrate appropriate parenting skills during visitation. In fact, the trial court found that respondent-appellant's extensive visitation with the children clearly demonstrated her *inability* to provide appropriately for the children. Accordingly, the trial 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).

Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant's 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 trial court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Christopher M. Murray
/s/ Hilda R. Gage
/s/ Kirsten Frank Kelly