

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of BRANDY NICOLE REEVES,
BRANDON CORTEZ REEVES, BRITTANY
MONIQUE REEVES, and BRAXTON LAMAR
KINCHEN, Minors.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

UNPUBLISHED
July 24, 2007

v

BENITA CRITE-HOBSON,

Respondent-Appellant.

No. 273889
Oakland Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 06-716098-NA

Before: White, P.J., Zahra and Fort Hood, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

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

We find no clear error in the trial court's determination that termination of respondent's parental rights was warranted in this case. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). To terminate parental rights at the initial dispositional hearing, the court must find "on the basis of clear and convincing legally admissible evidence" that petitioner proved the allegations in the petition and a statutory ground for termination in MCL 712A.19b(3). MCR 3.977(E)(3); *In re Jackson*, 199 Mich App 22, 25; 501 NW2d 182 (1993). Once the trial court finds at least one statutory ground for termination, it must order termination of parental rights, unless termination is clearly not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, *supra* at 354.

The evidence established that respondent has a lengthy history of drug use and not even minimally sufficient ability to provide proper care and protection for her children. There was evidence that respondent engaged in prostitution and panhandling. In addition to her own acts, respondent caused her two young daughters to engage in prostitution. Respondent also allowed her under-age daughter to have sex and cohabituate with an adult male. Thus, the evidence supports the trial court's determination that respondent caused sexual abuse, failed to prevent sexual abuse, and that there is a reasonable likelihood the sexual abuse will continue if the children are placed in respondent's home.

In addition, there was evidence that respondent frequently left the children without proper supervision, failed to maintain a clean, safe, and environmentally stable home with adequate resources, and allowed the children to miss numerous days of school causing them to fall behind academically. The evidence also showed that respondent used illicit drugs in front of the children, allowed her daughter to use illicit drugs and drink alcohol, and that respondent has been under the influence of drugs in the home in the presence of the children. Even after intensive treatment, respondent relapsed and again used drugs in her home. This evidence supports the trial court's findings that respondent failed to provide her children with proper care and custody and that she is not likely to do so within a reasonable time considering the ages of the children, and that the children would be harmed if returned to her custody.

Also, the evidence did not clearly show that termination of respondent's parental rights was not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo, supra* at 354. Consequently, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Helene N. White

/s/ Brian K. Zahra

/s/ Karen M. Fort Hood