

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of V.V.H., Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

TINA HYATT,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

CHARLES PEIRCE,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

December 13, 2002

No. 240115

Isabella Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 98-000531-NA

Before: Neff, P.J., and Hoekstra and O'Connell, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

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

Respondent argues that the trial court clearly erred in finding that clear and convincing evidence warranted termination under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (g). We disagree. We review the trial court's findings of fact for clear error. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 351; 612 NW2d 407 (2000); *In re Sours Minors*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999). The evidence clearly and convincingly showed that respondent was still unable to properly parent the child after 3½ years of intervention. Similar to the circumstances that led to the adjudication, there was evidence that respondent failed to properly feed and supervise the child during extended visitations. Additionally, the evidence indicated that respondent remained defensive and unwilling to take suggestions or participate in services. Respondent's parenting skills showed little improvement during the period of court intervention. Indeed, respondent terminated services that could have helped her, refused to participate in others, and did not cooperate with service care providers or accept suggestions for improvement. The trial court did not clearly err in finding that subsections 19b(3)(c)(i) and (g) were both established by clear and convincing evidence.

Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent's parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo Minors, supra* at 356-357. There was little evidence that the child, who had been in foster care most of her life, was bonded to respondent. Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights to the child.

Affirmed.

/s/ Janet T. Neff
/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra
/s/ Peter D. O'Connell