

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of DENMARIUS CARON
ODNEAL, Minor.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES, f/k/a
FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

UNPUBLISHED
November 15, 2005

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

RONALD ODNEAL,

Respondent-Appellant.

No. 262178
Oakland Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 03-685778-NA

Before: Murphy, P.J., and Sawyer and Meter, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondent appeals as of right from an order terminating his parental rights to the minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm.

The trial court did not err in finding that 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). With regard to respondent, the petition alleged a substance abuse problem and an extensive criminal history. Respondent was required to take numerous actions under his parent-agency agreement, and he only minimally complied. Significantly, respondent failed to provide three consecutive negative drug screens until almost a year after the child was made a temporary ward and, therefore, did not have visitation with the child for an entire year. He completed parenting classes, but only after the termination petition was filed and almost a year after his first referral. Respondent never provided the caseworker with proof that he had suitable housing or a legal source of income, and he did not provide the releases necessary for her to validate statements he made about his income. Respondent had an extensive criminal history and admitted that he had criminal drug charges pending against him at the time of the termination hearing.

Having found that at least one statutory ground for termination had been established, the trial court was required to terminate respondent's parental rights unless there was clear evidence on the whole record that termination was not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Respondent saw the child only twice since the child was born and, therefore, it could not have been argued that a bond existed

between them. Additionally, the psychologist testified that respondent seemed more concerned with how the child would meet his needs instead of how he would meet the child's needs. Respondent believed that the child would raise his self-esteem and help him to become a better person. The psychologist believed that termination was appropriate because respondent lacked basic parenting skills and had an extensive criminal history. Under the circumstances, reversal is unwarranted.

Affirmed.

/s/ William B. Murphy

/s/ David H. Sawyer

/s/ Patrick M. Meter