

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of JOSLYN LEE REDINGER,  
Minor.

---

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

JANET REDINGER,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED

June 24, 2008

No. 280787

Oakland Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 06-724388-NA

Before: Meter, P.J., and Smolenski and Servitto, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from the trial court order terminating her parental rights under MCL 712A.19b(3)(b)(ii), (j), and (l). We affirm.

Respondent admitted to certain allegations of the permanent custody petition, waived a trial on the statutory allegations, and requested a best interests hearing. She argues on appeal that the trial court clearly erred in its best interests determination. This Court reviews decisions terminating parental rights for clear error. MCR 3.977(J). Clear error has been defined as a decision that strikes this Court as more than just maybe or probably wrong. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Termination of parental rights is mandatory if the trial court finds that the petitioner established a statutory ground for termination, “unless the court finds that termination is clearly not in the child’s best interest.” *Id.* at 344.

Respondent’s parental rights to her three other children were terminated after the father of two of the children and of the minor child in this case confessed to punching their four-month-old son, causing a skull fracture and other injuries that led him to be blind and mentally handicapped, have no muscle control, and suffer seizures. The father was convicted of first-degree and third-degree child abuse and sentenced to ten to 15 years in prison. Respondent pleaded guilty to fourth-degree child abuse of the older children and received probation. She married the father after their son was injured and continued their relationship throughout these proceedings.

Based on the serious injuries to the minor child’s sibling, respondent’s continued relationship with the father, and her failure to recognize and acknowledge the danger that the

father posed, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that termination was not contrary to the minor child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); MCR 3.977(J).

Affirmed.

/s/ Patrick M. Meter  
/s/ Michael R. Smolenski  
/s/ Deborah A. Servitto