

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

In the Matter of KYLIA LYNETTE JOHNSON and  
KLARENCE ANTONIO JOHNSON, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

LINDA DIANNA WADE, a/k/a LINDA DIANNA  
WADE JOHNSON

Respondent-Appellant,

and

KARL ANTHONY JOHNSON,

Respondent.

---

UNPUBLISHED

November 30, 1999

No. 216276

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 92-300944

Before: Jansen, P.J., and Hoekstra and J. R. Cooper\*, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from a family court order terminating her parental rights to the minor children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) and (g); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(3)(c)(i) and (g).<sup>1</sup> We affirm.

The family court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination were established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 5.974(I); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989); *In re Hall-Smith*, 222 Mich App 470, 472-473; 564 NW2d 156 (1997). Respondent-appellant's long history of substance-abuse, and failed efforts at reform in this regard, well support the court's decision. See *In re Conley*, 216 Mich App 41, 44; 549 NW2d 353 (1996). We

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

note that respondent-appellant maintains on appeal that, while she has not completed the process of reform, she is attempting to do so. However, what respondent-appellant characterizes as her dedication to correct her substance abuse problem may better be characterized as her plain failure to do so after ostensibly having had this goal for several years.

Further, respondent-appellant failed to show that termination of her parental rights was “clearly not” in the children’s best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); MSA 27.3178(598.19b)(5); *In re Hall-Smith, supra* at 472-473. Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant’s parental rights to the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Kathleen Jansen

/s/ Joel P. Hoekstra

/s/ Jessica R. Cooper

<sup>1</sup> The court also terminated the parental rights of the children’s father, respondent Karl Anthony Johnson, but he has not appealed that decision and is not a party to this appeal.