

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

UNPUBLISHED
January 8, 2013

In the Matter of Q. CAMPBELL, Minor.

No. 310438
Oakland Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 11-791543-NA

Before: RONAYNE KRAUSE, P.J., and SERVITTO and SHAPIRO, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent N. Campbell appeals as of right from a circuit court order terminating her parental rights to the minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(g), (i), (j), and (l). Respondent's sole claim on appeal is that the trial court erred in finding that termination of her parental rights was in the child's best interests. See MCL 712A.19b(5); MCR 3.977(E)(4). We affirm because the evidence amply supports the trial court's findings.

We review the trial court's decision regarding the child's best interests for clear error. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000); MCR 3.977(K).

The evidence showed that respondent had a history of mental illness and substance abuse and was unable to take care of the child's older siblings. Two older children were removed from respondent's care in 2004. Respondent failed to participate in services for reunification and her parental rights to those children were terminated in 2006. Another child was removed from respondent's care in 2007 and respondent's parental rights to that child were terminated as well. Respondent's problems continued unabated. Respondent used drugs and alcohol while pregnant with the child at issue here, and she spent her time panhandling and soliciting, which led to a brief stay in jail during which time the child was born. Respondent's behavior in the hospital showed that her mental illness was not under control and medication was prescribed. After respondent was released from jail, she resumed soliciting and using drugs and alcohol, and she was jailed once again. Due to her continued drug use, she was never able to visit the child and had not seen him since his birth. In addition, respondent had not held a job for several years and had no source of income. The evidence supports the trial court's findings that respondent was unable to take care of the child and unlikely to benefit from services if given another opportunity to participate. The trial court did not clearly err in finding that termination of respondent's parental rights was in the child's best interests.

Affirmed.

/s/ Amy Ronayne Krause

/s/ Deborah A. Servitto

/s/ Douglas B. Shapiro