

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of NAYSHELLE RENEE
THOMPSON, Minor.

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

NAYSHELLE RENEE THOMPSON,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

October 20, 2009

No. 291580

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 06-454174

Before: Fort Hood, P.J., and Sawyer and Donofrio, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent, a juvenile, appeals as of right from a circuit court supplemental order of disposition removing her from her father's home. Because the circuit court did not abuse its discretion in removing respondent from her father's home, we affirm. This appeal has been decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

We review the circuit court's dispositional order for an abuse of discretion. *In re Ricks*, 167 Mich App 285, 295; 421 NW2d 667 (1988). An abuse of discretion occurs if the court's decision is outside the range of principled outcomes. *Woodard v Custer*, 476 Mich 545, 557; 719 NW2d 842 (2006); *People v Babcock*, 469 Mich 247, 269; 666 NW2d 231 (2003).

Once the court acquires jurisdiction over a juvenile, it must hold a dispositional hearing to determine what measures to take. MCR 3.943(A); MCL 712A.18(1). Such measures may be as lenient as dismissing the petition with a warning to the juvenile or as harsh as out-of-home confinement, and include placing the juvenile "under supervision in the juvenile's own home." MCL 712A.18(1)(a), (b), and (e). If a child remains under the court's jurisdiction, an order may be amended or supplemented within the authority granted under §18. MCL 712A.19(1). In making second and subsequent dispositions, "the court must consider imposing increasingly severe sanctions, which may include . . . ordering a juvenile who has been residing at home into an out-of-home placement[.]" MCR 3.943(E)(2).

The circuit court did not abuse its discretion in removing respondent from her father's home. Respondent came under the court's jurisdiction because she was beyond her father's control and had anger management issues. Despite community placement, respondent's

behaviors did not improve. She did not attend therapy regularly to address her anger issues, she did not attend school regularly, and she continued to be suspended for fighting when she did attend school. Even when respondent was temporarily removed from the home pending the hearing, she was involved in another altercation and was expelled from school. Because in-home placement with services was not meeting respondent's needs for rehabilitation, the circuit court did not abuse its discretion in removing respondent from the home.

Affirmed.

/s/ Karen M. Fort Hood

/s/ David H. Sawyer

/s/ Pat M. Donofrio