

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of DYNASTY DESTINY RENE
MATHIS, Minor.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

DEONNA LAURA MATHIS,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

GERALD JOHNSON,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

April 23, 2009

No. 287499

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 06-458372-NA

Before: Borrello, P.J., and Murphy and M. J. Kelly, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant Deonna Laura Mathis appeals as of right the order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). Because we conclude that there were no errors warranting relief, we affirm.

To terminate parental rights, a trial court must first find that at least one of the statutory grounds was proven by clear and convincing evidence. *In re Trejo Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 350; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Once a statutory ground for termination of parental rights is established, the court must terminate if it finds that termination of parental rights is in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5). This Court reviews a trial court's finding that a ground for termination was established by clear and convincing evidence for clear error. MCR 3.977(J); *In re JK*, 468 Mich 202, 209; 661 NW2d 216 (2003).

The child was brought into care because of inappropriate housing and numerous physical injuries to the child. Respondent-appellant never found appropriate housing during this case, did not fully cooperate with individual counseling and anger management, and submitted only two out of more than 50 requested drug screens. In light of this evidence, the trial court did not clearly err when it found that the statutory grounds for termination set forth in MCL

712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j) were proven by clear and convincing evidence. Furthermore, we find no merit in respondent-appellant's argument that the alleged improvement in her condition after the order terminating her parental rights somehow rendered the court's previous findings erroneous.

The trial court also did not clearly err in finding that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was in the minor child's best interests. *Trejo, supra* at 356-357. While there was evidence that respondent-appellant had a good bond with the child and that she was always appropriate during her parenting time, this evidence was outweighed by the evidence that termination was in the child's best interests. The child came into care with numerous unexplained new and old injuries. The record revealed that respondent-appellant did not have appropriate housing, was illiterate, and failed to cooperate with individual counseling, anger management, and drug screens. Respondent-appellant made little, if any, progress in the two years the child was in foster care. Under these circumstances, the trial court did not err in finding that termination was in the child's best interests.

Affirmed.

/s/ Stephen L. Borrello

/s/ William B. Murphy

/s/ Michael J. Kelly