

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of SIRGREGORY WASHINGTON,
Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

GREGORY WASHINGTON,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

LETHA BLAND,

Respondent.

In the Matter of SIRGREGORY WASHINGTON,
Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

LETHA BLAND,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

GREGORY WASHINGTON,

UNPUBLISHED
December 2, 2003

No. 247219
Kent Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 02-250801-NA

No. 247480
Kent Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 02-250801-NA

Respondent.

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

MEMORANDUM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondents appeal as of right and by leave granted the order terminating their parental rights to the minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(i), (c)(i), and (l). We affirm.

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), now MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Respondent Washington made nearly no effort to complete the treatment plan. He waited seven months, until the petitioner pursued termination of parental rights, before even signing the treatment plan and then failed to follow through on any of the goals toward reunification. While the State of South Carolina did early in the proceedings perform a home study and draft a favorable Family Assessment Summary, Washington's reliance upon this evaluation is misplaced because he was living with his parents and never established that he was paying rent or saving for a home of his own. Washington never fully demonstrated that he was invested in his son's care and able to independently parent his child. Thus, the trial court did not err when it found that MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(i) and (c)(i) were established by clear and convincing evidence and provided grounds for termination of Washington's parental rights.

Similarly, clear and convincing evidence was presented to support termination of respondent Bland's parental rights under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (l). At the time of termination, the condition that led to adjudication, Bland's mental instability, continued to hamper her ability to care for her child. Further, her parental rights to two other children were terminated in Georgia under proceedings similar to those in this state.

Finally, the evidence did not show that termination of either respondents' parental rights was clearly not in the child'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 respondents' parental rights to their child.

Affirmed.

/s/ Christopher M. Murray

/s/ Hilda R. Gage

/s/ Kirsten Frank Kelly