

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

---

In the Matter of EMMANUEL DUNCAN SMITH,  
JR., MARTEZE TERREL SMITH and D'MAREA  
ANTONIO SMITH, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

ANITRIA LAVONNE WEEMS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

EMANUEL SMITH

Respondent.

---

UNPUBLISHED

April 20, 2001

No. 226887

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 97-359488

Before: Gage, P.J., and Cavanagh and Wilder, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant (hereinafter respondent), biological mother of the involved minor children, appeals as of right a family court order terminating her parental rights pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i), (g). We affirm.

Our review of the record reveals that the family court did not clearly err in determining that these statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Ample evidence demonstrated that respondent neglected the children's physical and special needs while they resided in her custody and that, during the greater than two-year period that the children were

temporary court wards, respondent made minimal efforts to comply with the treatment plan and improve her ability to parent the children.<sup>1</sup>

Furthermore, despite the unrebutted evidence demonstrating respondent's love for the children, the evidence establishing (1) the children's special needs, including Marteze's very serious medical conditions, (2) respondent's obligation to address the needs of another child born in November 1998, (3) respondent's continued neglect during the children's lengthy, temporary court wardship to improve her parenting skills, attend counseling, obtain a job or maintain a steady residence, and (4) the paternal grandmother's demonstrated ability to address the children's needs and bond with the children, and expressed intent to adopt them, we cannot conclude that the family court clearly erred in finding that termination of respondent's parental rights would serve the children's best interests.<sup>2</sup> MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000).

Affirmed.

/s/ Hilda R. Gage  
/s/ Mark J. Cavanagh  
/s/ Kurtis T. Wilder

---

<sup>1</sup> Specifically, respondent failed to achieve the treatment plan's goals that she maintain a stable residence, obtain employment, enter domestic violence counseling, attend Marteze's doctor and therapy appointments, visit the children weekly, and regularly contact her case worker.

<sup>2</sup> While the family court incorrectly found that the burden had shifted to respondent to demonstrate that termination was not in the children's best interests, *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 352-353; 612 NW2d 407 (2000), we will not disturb the family court's ruling when the court reaches the correct result for the wrong reason. *In re Powers*, 208 Mich App 582, 591; 528 NW2d 799 (1995).