

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

---

In the Matter of L.N.S., S.C.S., and T.R.S., Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

WILLIAM EDWARD STRONG,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

PATRICIA EDWARDS,

Respondent.

---

In the Matter of L.N.S., S.C.S., and T.R.S., Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

PATRICIA EDWARDS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

WILLIAM EDWARD STRONG,

Respondent.

---

UNPUBLISHED  
October 2, 2001

No. 229450  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 94-316358

No. 229845  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 94-316358

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

MEMORANDUM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondents appeal as of right from the family court order terminating their parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (g). We affirm. This case is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

The family court did not clearly err in finding that §§ 19b(3)(c)(i) and (g) were established by clear and convincing evidence. See MCR 5.974(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Petitioner's evidence established that respondent mother had a history of deficient parenting due to mental illness and drug abuse, and that she failed to correct these deficiencies. Petitioner's evidence also established that respondent father was unable to provide proper care and custody for the children, and that he neither arranged a guardianship nor enabled himself to care for the children. Because the evidence failed to establish that termination of respondents' parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests, the trial court properly terminated their parental rights. See MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

Respondent father also contends that his due process rights were violated because the petition did not specifically allege that he had been non-compliant with the treatment plan. We disagree. The petition was adequate to inform respondent father of the proofs he would have to overcome to avoid termination of his parental rights. See *In re Perry*, 193 Mich App 648, 651; 484 NW2d 768 (1992). Respondent father's contention that the family court did not advise him until January 2000 that he was required to comply with the treatment plan is also without merit. The family court indicated in each supplemental order of disposition that respondent father was under orders to comply with the plan.

Affirmed.

/s/ Mark J. Cavanagh  
/s/ Jane E. Markey  
/s/ Jessica R. Cooper