

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of J.J.J., Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

BARBARA JEAN HOLMES,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

March 11, 2003

No. 241535

Wayne Circuit Court

LC No. 81-228460

Before: Meter, P.J., and Jansen and Talbot, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from the trial court's order terminating her parental rights to the minor child 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).

This Court reviews a trial court's decision to terminate parental rights for clear error. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Sours*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999). If the trial court determines that the petitioner established the existence of one or more statutory grounds for termination by clear and convincing evidence, then the trial court must terminate the respondent's parental rights unless it determines that to do so is clearly not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 354; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). We review for clear error the trial court's decision with regard to the child's best interests. *Trejo*, *supra* at 356-357.

On the record presented for our review, we find that the trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence.¹ The child became a temporary ward of the court primarily because of respondent's

¹ We note that although respondent cites MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) in her appellate brief, she fails to challenge the trial court's finding under this subsection or develop her argument in any way,

failure to provide suitable housing. At the termination trial, almost two years later, respondent still did not have suitable housing. Respondent did not participate in any job training programs or otherwise attempt to find employment but elected to rely solely on her SSI benefits and reside with friends or relatives or in shelters. Furthermore, she failed to participate in individual and family counseling as required by her parent agency agreement, contending that the problem was with her children and not herself. Respondent admitted that she had a drug problem and participated in inpatient treatment but declined to provide drug screens when requested and submitted some positive screens even after her treatment.

Furthermore, we find that the evidence did not demonstrate that termination of respondent's parental rights was antithetical to the best interests of the child. MCL 712A.19b(5); *Trejo, supra* at 356-357. Although a bond existed between respondent and J.J.J., respondent failed to consistently maintain weekly visits with the child, failed to find appropriate housing, and failed to overcome her drug addiction. Consequently, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights.

Affirmed.

/s/ Patrick M. Meter
/s/ Kathleen Jansen
/s/ Michael J. Talbot

thereby abandoning the issue. See *Palo Group Foster Care, Inc v Dep't of Social Services*, 228 Mich App 140, 152; 577 NW2d 200 (1998).