

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of CASEY JOSEPH GORNEY,  
Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

SHIRLEY ANN BAYSDELL,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

ROBERT LEO GORNEY,

Respondent.

---

UNPUBLISHED  
December 14, 2004

No. 256586  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 03-417012-NA

Before: Markey, P.J., and Fitzgerald and Owens, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

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

The trial court did not clearly err in finding 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 principal condition that led to adjudication was respondent-appellant's inability to properly supervise and care for her child based on her limited cognitive abilities. The evidence established that, even after considerable specialized services, respondent-appellant was not able to achieve sufficient skills to enable her to safely care for the child.

Respondent-appellant's assertion that her constitutional rights were violated by the termination of her parental rights is not supported where she alleges no procedural errors and petitioner presented clear and convincing evidence of at least one statutory ground for termination. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 355; 612 NW2d 407 (2000); *In re Brock*, 442 Mich 101, 111; 499 NW2d 752 (1993). Her argument that the trial court erred in concluding reasonable efforts were made to reunite the family is not supported by the record. Respondent-appellant was afforded specialized services and consistent visitation. Petitioner was under no obligation to

provide services to respondent-appellant's live-in boyfriend who was not the legal or putative father and had no rights or obligations with regard to the child.

Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant's 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). Although respondent-appellant loved her child, her inability to interact with him resulted in there being no bond between herself and the child. Moreover, respondent-appellant was unable to care for herself and clearly could not have met the special needs of the child.

Affirmed.

/s/ Jane E. Markey  
/s/ E. Thomas Fitzgerald  
/s/ Donald S. Owens