

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of MATTHEW CRAWLEY, Minor.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, f/k/a
FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

V

VINCENT TOMIRO CRAWLEY,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

TRACY MICHELLE SWAN,

Respondent.

In the Matter of MATTHEW CRAWLEY, Minor.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, f/k/a
FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

V

TRACY MICHELLE SWAN,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

VINCENT TOMIRO CRAWLEY,

UNPUBLISHED
April 4, 2006

No. 264756
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 93-307199-NA

No. 264757
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 93-307199-NA

Respondent.

Before: Hoekstra, P.J., and Wilder and Zahra, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondents appeal as of right the order of the trial court terminating their parental rights to their minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(b)(ii), (i), (j), and (l). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

Ample evidence existed on the record to support the trial court's decision to terminate respondents' parental rights. It was undisputed before the trial court that respondent mother's parental rights to 11 children previously had been terminated, and that respondent father's parental rights to five other children previously had been terminated. The record also showed that respondent mother failed to prevent the abuse of a sibling of the child, that prior attempts to rehabilitate respondents had been unsuccessful, and that there was a reasonable likelihood the child would be harmed if returned to respondents care. In addition, both respondents have a history of mental illness, drug use, and domestic violence and have taken almost no steps to address these issues, despite the availability of services. The trial court, therefore, did not err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination had been established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1997).

For the same reasons, the trial court did not err in determining that termination was not contrary to the best interests of the child. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

Affirmed.

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra
/s/ Kurtis T. Wilder
/s/ Brian K. Zahra