

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of DEQUAN MAURICE
DOUGLAS and ROMEO XAVIAR DAVID,
Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

RAMONA DOUGLAS, a/k/a RAMONA DENISE
DAVID,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

KEVIN SMITH and DECONDA WADE, a/k/a
DELCONDA WADE,

Respondents.

Before: Sawyer, P.J., and Gage and Owens, 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), (g) and (j). We affirm. This case is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). The conditions that led to adjudication were respondent-appellant's neglect of the children and substance abuse. The evidence clearly and convincingly established that over the course of more than three years, with the aid of multiple services and the giving of chance after chance, respondent never established that she could consistently and competently parent her children and lead a drug-free lifestyle. Respondent demonstrated a pattern of substance abuse, a pattern that she lacked the motivation to break. She entered six substance abuse treatment programs but completed only one. With respect to random drug screens, respondent did not consistently provide the screens as requested. When she did provide the

screens, they were frequently positive for cocaine. After more than three years of intervention, respondent-appellant never overcame her addiction or reached a point where she could parent her children with consistency and stability. At the time of termination, respondent-appellant was unemployed and lacked suitable housing. More significantly, respondent-appellant failed to establish that she was capable of living a drug-free lifestyle for the long term. Because respondent-appellant did not participate in or benefit from the services offered, 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. Similarly, there was clear and convincing evidence that respondent-appellant failed to provide proper care and custody for her children.

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 her children.

Affirmed.

/s/ David H. Sawyer

/s/ Hilda R. Gage

/s/ Donald S. Owens