

s STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of MICHELLE LANAY WALLS,
DAISHA JANAY WALLS, MICHAEL TONOKO
WALLS II, and ANTHONY LEE YOUNG,
Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

UNPUBLISHED
June 14, 2005

V

JULIA CHANDLER,

Respondent-Appellant,

No. 257783
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 02-407713-NA

and

MICHAEL WALLS and ANTONIO YOUNG,
a/k/a ANTHONY LEE YOUNG,

Respondents.

Before: Bandstra, P.J., and Fitzgerald and Meter, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent Julia Chandler appeals as of right from the trial court's order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). 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 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). The conditions that led to adjudication were that respondent had numerous criminal arrests and had left the minor children home alone after an arrest, the school-aged children went to school dirty and with poor hygiene, and one of the children had bladder and bowel problems for which respondent failed to get the necessary medical treatment. At the time of termination of respondent's parental rights, more than two years after the minor children were made temporary wards of the court, many aspects of her treatment plan remained unfulfilled by respondent. Respondent did not have housing and was living in a shelter. Additionally, she did not have steady, legal employment, although she claimed to have applied finally for SSI benefits. She attended parenting classes, but it was questionable whether she

benefited from them, and she had attended some individual therapy sessions, but not on a consistent basis. She also was not consistent in her visits with the minor children and did not sufficiently assist with their therapy and medical-related issues. Respondent had not complied with probation, having several probation violations. She did not keep in contact with her FIA worker on a consistent basis and did not comply with her drug screen requirements. Although respondent claims on appeal that petitioner failed to make reasonable efforts to reunite her with the children, the evidence establishes that many services were offered to her, but she did not follow through with and benefit sufficiently from them.

The court also did not clearly err in finding that it was not against the best interests of the minor children to terminate respondent's parental rights. MCL 712A.19b(5). While there was a bond between respondent and the two older children, these children were aware that respondent could not properly parent them and they did not wish to live with her. The bond between respondent and the two younger children was not as strong because they were so much younger. The children had rejection and abandonment issues stemming from respondent's inability to parent and other family members' inability to intervene and provide a permanent home. The minor children were all doing well in their current placements and needed stability, consistency, and permanence, which respondent was unable to provide for them.

Affirmed.

/s/ Richard A. Bandstra
/s/ E. Thomas Fitzgerald
/s/ Patrick M. Meter