

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

UNPUBLISHED  
May 24, 2011

In the Matter of WILSON/QUINN, Minors.

No. 301313  
Eaton Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 08-017098-NA

---

Before: MARKEY, P.J., and FITZGERALD and SHAPIRO, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent C. Quinn appeals as of right from the trial court's order 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(K); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). The children were removed from respondent's custody in October 2008 because of respondent's substance abuse, lack of stable and suitable housing, and failure to properly parent the children. The home had no running water, working toilet, or beds, and no food. Respondent frequently left the children with relatives while she was involved in drug use in the home. Respondent also lacked financial support to properly care for the children and was involved in criminal activity. Respondent only minimally participated in services and failed to benefit from the services that were provided. She failed to follow through with the recommendations from a psychological evaluation, which included a drug assessment and counseling, and failed to comply with drug screening. Because of her failure to comply with drug screening, she had not visited either child since May 2009. She attended some parenting classes, but failed to complete the course. She continued to be involved in criminal activity, which led to additional jail confinement and prevented her from participating in services. From the date of the children's removal until May 2010, respondent had spent more than 230 days in jail. On the day of the termination hearing, she was again in jail, serving a 330-day sentence. In addition, she never obtained suitable housing or employment.

Considering respondent's lack of stability and failure to successfully resolve the issues that led to the children's removal despite an opportunity to participate in services for two years, there was no reasonable expectation that she would be able to properly parent the children within a reasonable time. In addition, considering respondent's unresolved issues and the children's

special needs, there is a reasonable likelihood that the children would be harmed if returned to respondent's home.

Further, considering that respondent failed to make any progress in addressing the issues that brought the children into care, as well as the evidence that the children were not bonded with respondent and have special needs, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that termination of her parental rights was in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Accordingly, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent's parental rights.

Affirmed.

/s/ Jane E. Markey  
/s/ E. Thomas Fitzgerald  
/s/ Douglas B. Shapiro