

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

UNPUBLISHED  
September 27, 2011

In the Matter of SALLIE, Minors.

No. 302984  
Macomb Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC Nos. 2009-000630-NA  
2009-000631-NA

---

Before: SERVITTO, P.J., and MARKEY and K.F. KELLY, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals by right the trial court 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 clear and convincing evidence supported the statutory grounds for termination. MCR 3.977(K); *In re Sours*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999).

The conditions that led to the adjudication were that respondent abandoned her two young children to her mother, had a history of drug and alcohol abuse, had no income or housing, and her whereabouts were unknown. Respondent did not appear until five months later, when she received and signed her parent/agency agreement. In her own words, she spent the next year “playing” and did not comply with any of the provisions of the parent/agency agreement. At the termination hearing, 15 months after the adjudication, respondent had just been released from a 60-day inpatient drug rehabilitation program. She had not visited with her children since they had been removed over a year earlier, although she had spoken to them from time to time over the telephone. She was placed in an outpatient facility where she would stay for approximately six months or until she obtained Section 8 housing and employment. Other than the completion of the inpatient program, the conditions that led to the adjudication continued to exist. Respondent had not demonstrated that she could remain drug free or that she could take control of her life.

Respondent had not provided proper care or support for her children since some time before the initial petition was filed. She had not arranged or even requested visitation during this case. Considering her history, her lack of compliance with the parent/agency agreement, her failure to cooperate with the agency, and the ages of her children, there was no reasonable expectation that she would be able to rectify the conditions leading to adjudication and provide proper care and custody for her children within a reasonable time. The trial court did not clearly

err in finding that “return of the children to her care could cause a substantial risk of harm to the children.”

The trial court also did not clearly err in finding that termination of respondent’s parental rights was in the children’s best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-367; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). The children were bonded with their maternal grandmother. Respondent had not shown that she cared about them or their welfare. She had not visited with them for over a year and did not express any desire to spend time with them. She had not attended parenting classes and had not demonstrated any parenting skills or the capacity to be a good mother to the children. She had just been released from the inpatient program, and there was no evidence that she would remain sober and drug free, find and maintain employment, or establish a home for her children. The children had been without the care of their mother since before this case was brought into the system. They needed and deserved permanency.

Affirmed

/s/ Deborah A. Servitto  
/s/ Jane E. Markey  
/s/ Kirsten Frank Kelly