

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of ANTHONY DEJUAN FARMER
and TANTANIEA TYLANA WALKER, Minors.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, f/k/a
FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

UNPUBLISHED
November 14, 2006

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

PATRICE DAWNELLE WALKER,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

VOLLEE BROWN, a/k/a VOLLEE BROWN,

Respondent.

No. 268662
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 96-347750-NA

Before: Fort Hood, P.J., and Murray and Donofrio, 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 finding that reasonable efforts were made by the agency to aid in the unification of the family. MCL 712A.18f(4); MCR 3.977(J); *In re Sours*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999). Respondent did not take advantage of the services offered to her and admitted that she continued with substance abuse throughout the pendency of the case. Petitioner made reasonable efforts for respondent to receive a psychiatric examination and medication, and it was not the responsibility of the caseworker to provide a picture ID for respondent.

The evidence did not show that termination of respondent's parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341; 354-355; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). The only evidence offered by respondent regarding this issue was that she was appropriate during visits, and there was bonding between her and the children. However, her problems of poor parenting, lack of income and employment, and substance abuse date back

to at least 1996. None of the conditions that brought the children into care in November 2004 had been rectified by the time of the trial 14 months later. The children needed permanency, and the trial court did not err in finding that termination of respondent's parental rights would be in the children's best interests.

Respondent was not denied the effective assistance of counsel. *People v Sabin (On Second Remand)*, 242 Mich App 656, 658-659; 620 NW2d 19 (2000); *In re Simon*, 171 Mich App 443, 447; 431 NW2d 71 (1988). The record does not reveal mistakes by counsel that demonstrate a performance below an objective standard of reasonableness under prevailing norms or that there was a reasonable probability that, had counsel moved to reopen the proofs for respondent's testimony, the result of the proceeding would have been different as respondent now claims. *People v Ginther*, 390 Mich 436, 443; 212 NW2d 922 (1973); *People v Effinger*, 212 Mich App 67, 69; 536 NW2d 809 (1995).

Affirmed.

/s/ Karen M. Fort Hood
/s/ Christopher M. Murray
/s/ Pat M. Donofrio