

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

---

In the Matter of CRYSTAL BRASSEUR, JOLYN  
BRASSEUR, and TORI MILLER, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

SARA GRABOWSKI,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED  
December 9, 2004

No. 255711  
Cheboygan Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 03-002204-NA

Before: O'Connell, P.J., and Bandstra and Donofrio, 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)(c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). The conditions that led to adjudication included the instability in respondent's housing, household members, finances, and relationships, and her poor parenting ability, and the resulting effect on the children. Although the evidence suggests that respondent had obtained some stability in her relationship with her current partner, the evidence overwhelmingly established that she failed to rectify the primary issues of housing, income, and parenting ability. At the heart of that failure was her inability to recognize her responsibility for her children's behavioral problems, her deficiencies as a parent, and her need to change. She failed to obtain and maintain adequate income; her partner's income was barely enough to provide for the two of them and her partner's child without the addition of respondent's three young daughters. She also failed to rectify her pattern of frequent relocation and unstable, unsuitable housing arrangements. The trial court did not err in concluding that, given respondent's refusal to accept that she had improperly cared for her children, she was unlikely to rectify these conditions within a reasonable time. Even on appeal, respondent suggests that petitioner was at fault for not providing her services while she lived in Florida. However, the trial court correctly concluded that respondent chose to remain in Florida rather than return to Michigan where her children were and further wasted time by not pursuing services there.

Therefore, the evidence clearly established that there was no reasonable likelihood respondent would rectify the issues leading to jurisdiction, respondent failed to provide the children with support, and the children would likely suffer harm if returned to respondent's care. MCL 712A.19b(3). Further, 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). Therefore, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the minor children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Peter D. O'Connell  
/s/ Richard A. Bandstra  
/s/ Pat M. Donofrio