

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of DOUGLAS DONTAE SINGLETON, IRENE MAWANA HARRIS, and LAKEISHA LARANDIA HARRIS, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

CYNTHIA ANN DAVIS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

R. C. HARRIS and DOUGLAS SINGLETON,

Respondents.

UNPUBLISHED
September 29, 2000

No. 221331
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 97-360821

Before: Collins, P.J. and Jansen and Zahra, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from an order of the family court terminating her parental rights to the three minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j); MSA 27.398(598.19b)(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). The parental rights of the two fathers¹ were also terminated; however, they are not parties to this appeal. We affirm the family court's order.

The family first came to the attention of the court in November 1997 because of a police response to a call regarding "family trouble." The police discovered that respondent had hit Lakeisha

¹ We note that Douglas Singleton died on July 19, 1985, due to a gunshot wound to the head. He is the father of Douglas Dontae Singleton.

several times on her legs with an extension cord. At the January 21, 1998, hearing, respondent-appellant admitted that she whipped the child on her legs, that she did not have any electricity in the house, that the furnace was not working and she was heating the house with stove burners, that she receives SSI benefits as her only source of income, and that she was spending some of her money on alcohol and crack cocaine. The children were then made temporary court wards. Respondent-appellant's parental rights to the children were later terminated in June 1999, ostensibly because of her failure to make any real progress concerning her alcohol and drug abuse, her failure to obtain suitable housing, and her failure to show any type of long-term commitment or planning for the children.

First, we find that the family court's findings that the statutory grounds for termination were supported by clear and convincing evidence and are not clearly erroneous. MCL 712A.19b(3); MSA 27.398(598.19b)(3); MCR 5.974(F)(3); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; ___ NW2d ___ (2000). Over the nearly two years that the children were temporary court wards, respondent-appellant made very little progress. She failed to find suitable housing for herself and the children, she visited the children only once or twice a month and otherwise seemed to have very little contact with the children, and, most importantly, she failed to address her substance abuse problem. As the family court correctly stated in its findings, respondent-appellant "failed to substantially and consistently comply with the case plan or make sufficient progress to allow the children to be safely returned to her care."

Next, the family court did not clearly err by finding that reasonable efforts had been made by the agency to reunite the family. MCR 5.973(A)(5)(c); MCL 712A.18f(1); MSA 27.398(598.18f)(1). As noted by the family court, the agency gave respondent-appellant referrals for housing, drug treatment programs (including transportation), and therapy. The only program that she successfully completed was a parenting class at Hutzel Hospital. Further, the foster care worker requested that respondent-appellant be given more time to indicate progress at the April 1999 hearing, which was granted by the family court; however, respondent-appellant failed to submit all required drug screens in a timely manner, and her case was closed at a drug treatment program for nonattendance. Consequently, the family court's findings in this regard are not clearly erroneous.

Lastly, we find that the family court's finding that termination of parental rights was clearly not contrary to the best interests of the children is not clearly erroneous. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.398(598.19b)(5); *Trejo, supra*, p 357.

Affirmed.

/s/ Jeffrey G. Collins

/s/ Kathleen Jansen

/s/ Brian K. Zahra