

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of QUAZAY WALKER, Minor.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

DEBRA WALKER,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED

September 30, 2004

No. 253923

Kent Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 91-223400

Before: Borrello, P.J., and Murray and Fort Hood, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(g), (i), (j), and (l). We affirm.

Respondent does not argue that the trial court erred in determining that the statutory grounds for termination of parental rights were established by clear and convincing evidence, but challenges the trial court's finding that the evidence did not show that termination of respondent's parental rights was clearly contrary to the child's best interests. A review of the entire record supported the trial court's finding that the evidence did not show that termination of respondent's parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

The child involved in this proceeding was respondent's fifth child and was removed from her at birth. Respondent admitted to using cocaine throughout her pregnancy. The evidence showed that respondent had been involved in child protective proceedings since 1991 and had a twenty-three-year struggle with drug addiction, but she had sustained a six-month period of sobriety since commencement of the current proceeding. While this period of sobriety was significant for respondent, and respondent exhibited a new commitment, the time for respondent's commitment to sobriety was prior to the child's birth, after her parental rights to his sibling had been terminated in 2000.

Given the lack of a child-parent bond in this case, respondent's long history of lack of appropriate parenting because of drug addiction, and her unsuccessful attempts at treatment for

her drug addiction in the past, the trial court did not err in finding that termination of respondent's parental rights was not clearly contrary to the minor child's best interests.

Affirmed.

/s/ Stephen L. Borrello  
/s/ Christopher M. Murray  
/s/ Karen M. Fort Hood