

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of DENZEL DEVON ANTHONY
ALEXANDER, DEANGELO SANDCHIZE
ALEXANDER, and DARRION TONY
ALEXANDER, Minors.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

UNPUBLISHED
July 19, 2005

v

LAKESHIA RAQUEL ALEXANDER,

Respondent-Appellant,

No. 259380
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 03-421740

and

DEVON ANTHONY GILLIARD and LARUE
HURTON,

Respondents.

Before: Cooper, P.J., and Fort Hood and R.S. Gribbs*, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

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

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). The condition that led to adjudication was respondent-appellant's inability to provide proper care for the children because of her drug and alcohol abuse. The evidence clearly and convincingly demonstrated that, at the time of termination, respondent-appellant had yet to address her substance abuse issues. Respondent-appellant made little effort to comply with the treatment plan. After several years of intervention, she never reached a point where she could parent her children with consistency and stability. At the time of termination, respondent-appellant's living arrangements were uncertain, she did not have sufficient income to

* Former Court of Appeals judge, sitting on the Court of Appeals by assignment.

support three children, and she failed to demonstrate that she was living a drug-free lifestyle. Indeed, respondent-appellant seemed indifferent to her children's needs. She visited sporadically, failed to communicate frequently with the FIA, and missed several court hearings, including the one at which parental rights were terminated. Because respondent-appellant did not participate in or benefit from the services offered, the conditions that led to adjudication continued to exist at the time of termination, and there was no reasonable likelihood that the conditions would be rectified within a reasonable time.

Further, the evidence failed to establish that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to her children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Jessica R. Cooper
/s/ Karen M. Fort Hood
/s/ Roman S. Gribbs