

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of DARNISHA SILER, DARIA
JANAY SILER, DWAYNE WILSON, and
MAXINE WILSON, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

UNPUBLISHED
April 24 2001

v

No. 227992
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 99-376530

BARBARA ROCHELLE SILER,

Respondent-Appellant

and

DWAYNE EDWARD WILSON, SR.,

Respondent.

Before: Cavanagh, P.J., and Markey and Collins, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant Barbara Rochelle Siler (respondent) appeals as of right from the order terminating her parental rights to the minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), and (g); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), and (g). We affirm.

The circuit court did not clearly err in finding that subsection 19b(3)(c)(i) was established by clear and convincing evidence. *In re Jackson*, 199 Mich App 22, 25; 501 NW2d 182 (1993). The conditions that led to the adjudication were, among other things, respondent's drug dependency and the unsuitable and unsafe conditions in her home. Thus, the primary requirements of respondent's treatment plan were to complete substance abuse treatment, establish and maintain safe and suitable housing for the children, and maintain contact with case workers.

The record shows that respondent failed to comply in any regard with her treatment plan during the time that her children were in care. She admitted to using cocaine three weeks before the trial and had not been evaluated for any sort of rehabilitation program. Although respondent asserted at the termination hearing that she had suitable housing for the children, because she failed to maintain contact with the case workers or respond to their inquiries, they were not able to visit and evaluate the suitability of the home. Finally, respondent acknowledged that she had temporarily lost custody of her children in Illinois due, at least in part, to her substance abuse, and had not managed since that time to remain drug free, despite regaining custody of her children. We conclude, therefore, that the circuit court did not clearly err in finding that the conditions that led to the adjudication continue to exist and there is no reasonable likelihood that the conditions will be rectified within a reasonable time considering the children's ages. MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i). Further, the circuit court did not clearly err in concluding that termination of respondent's parental rights was clearly not in the minor child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5); *Trejo, supra* at 354.

Because only one statutory ground for termination must be established in order to terminate parental rights, we need not decide whether termination was also proper under subsections 19b(3)(a)(ii) and (g). MCL 712A.19b(3); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3); *Trejo, supra* at 360.

Affirmed.

/s/ Mark J. Cavanagh

/s/ Jane E. Markey

/s/ Jeffrey G. Collins