

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of CLINTONINA UNIQUE DEAN  
HARPER, LA'KAYLA ARTIST MON'E  
HARPER, ETOY TIA JEAN DEAN-HARPER,  
NAZILEE JASMINE WALKER, a/k/a NAZILEE  
WALKER-HARPER, and MARKTELL  
WALKER-HARPER, a/k/a MARKLEVS ANDRE  
WALKER-HARPER, Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

JOHNNIE MAE HARPER,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

NATHANIEL WALKER and LAMONT SMITH,

Respondents.

---

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

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the order terminating her parental rights 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 determining that at least one of the statutory grounds for termination was proven by clear and convincing evidence. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 355; 612 NW2d 407 (2000); *In re Sours*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999). The conditions that led to adjudication were respondent-appellant's lack of housing and her substance abuse problem. Respondent-appellant contends that the trial court erred in terminating her parental rights because she attended a drug assessment and alcoholics anonymous or narcotics anonymous meetings, submitted drug screens, and sought treatment with Ruth Usher through Professional Prevention Restoration and Consulting Services (PPRCS). Although there was

testimony that respondent-appellant had a drug assessment done in 2003 at Herman Keifer, additional testimony indicated that she did not attend the drug treatment program that was referred to her. Respondent-appellant was later referred to PPRCS and attended therapy sessions with Usher. However, Usher testified that respondent-appellant attended only five sessions. Usher opined that, given respondent-appellant's history, she needed to see a counselor for at least ninety days or more to benefit from those services. Based on such testimony, we find that the trial court did not clearly err in finding that respondent-appellant's substance abuse problem continued to exist. Given the amount of time respondent-appellant was given to comply with the treatment plan, we also find that the trial court did not err in finding that this condition would not be rectified within a reasonable time. In addition, respondent-appellant still did not have stable housing for the children at the time of the termination trial.

Further, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was not contrary to the best interests of the children. *Trejo, supra* at 353. Therefore, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights.

Affirmed.

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