

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of ANGELINA MAY GUZMAN,  
ANNIE MARIE GUZMAN, and ANGEL LE  
ANNE GUZMAN, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,  
  
Petitioner-Appellee,

UNPUBLISHED  
January 8, 2004

v

ELLA BROOK MAY, a/k/a ELLA BROOKE  
MAY,

No. 247473  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 97-359005

Respondent-Appellant,

and

MIGUEL ANGEL GUZMAN,  
  
Respondent.

---

Before: Donofrio, P.J., and Griffin and Jansen, 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) and (g). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in determining 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). Protective services had been involved with respondent-appellant and her children since 1997, and despite provision of services by Families First and Wraparound in March 2001, the evidence showed that respondent-appellant remained unable to provide the children with proper housing, food, clothing, dental care, and other basic necessities. During the sixteen months of these proceedings, respondent-appellant completed parenting classes, a Clinic for Child Study, and had a legal source of income through SSI, but did not consistently attend counseling or submit drug screens showing that she was drug-free. Angel was born cocaine positive. Respondent-appellant's housing, which was a primary problem since 1997, never became stable. Given respondent-appellant's cognitive limitations and her inability

to improve the quality of her care and custody for her children in several years, the trial court did not clearly err in determining that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence.

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). The two older children were bonded with respondent-appellant, but would not receive even the most basic care if returned to her care.

Therefore, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Pat M. Donofrio  
/s/ Richard Allen Griffin  
/s/ Kathleen Jansen