

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of JAMIKA MICHELLE
COPELAND, Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

KENYAMA ROUSE,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

DIEDRA COPELAND,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

May 10, 2005

No. 257202

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 01-403084-NA

Before: Bandstra, P.J., and Fitzgerald and Meter, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the trial court order terminating his parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

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 evidence clearly demonstrated that respondent-appellant failed to substantially comply with the case treatment plan. Significantly, after being absent for the first eight years of the child's life, respondent-appellant, by his own admission, attended only fifty percent of the visits required by the case treatment plan. In addition, respondent-appellant never completed parenting classes and never provided a police clearance. The evidence indicated that, by the time of the permanent custody hearing, respondent-appellant had not achieved a father-daughter bond with the child.

Furthermore, we find no merit in respondent-appellant's argument that petitioner failed to make reasonable efforts to reunite him with his daughter because it failed to accommodate his

work schedule and car trouble and referred him to parenting classes that were inappropriate for the child's age. See MCL 712A.18f. Respondent-appellant pointed to no evidence that he ever asked petitioner for an accommodation because of his work schedule and car trouble. In addition, there was evidence that respondent-appellant failed to complete parenting classes when he was given a second referral to appropriate classes.

Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to the child.

Affirmed.

/s/ Richard A. Bandstra
/s/ E. Thomas Fitzgerald
/s/ Patrick M. Meter