

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of DESTINY AMANDA MARIE
HICKMAN and JOSHUA LEE HICKMAN,
Minors.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

JENNIFER LOUISE HICKMAN,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

LARRY EUGENE HAMILTON, JR.,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED

May 22, 2007

No. 273871

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 05-438361-NA

Before: White, P.J., and Saad and Murray, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent-appellant appeals as of right from the trial court order terminating her parental rights to the children under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j).¹ We affirm. This appeal is being decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

In February 2005, respondent-appellant left Destiny in a homeless shelter, failed to return before curfew, and was required to leave the shelter for violating curfew. The children were taken into the court's custody upon a finding that respondent-appellant lacked suitable housing or means to care for Destiny. The court later took jurisdiction over Joshua. Under her treatment plan, respondent-appellant was required to (1) obtain and maintain suitable housing for herself and the children, (2) complete individual therapy, (3) complete parenting classes, (4) complete domestic violence counseling to address her history of relationships with abusive men, (5) verify a legal source of income, (6) complete mental health services to address her comments that she

¹ Although respondent-appellant contends that the trial court also relied on § 19b(3)(a)(ii) in support of termination of her parental rights, the record indicates that the court applied this section only to the children's father.

had been diagnosed with bipolar disorder, (7) maintain contact with the caseworker, (8) visit the children weekly at the agency, and (9) obtain her GED.

Respondent-appellant failed to substantially comply with her plan during the 18 months the children were in the court's temporary custody. She drifted from homes with family and friends and shelters but failed to establish her own home. She produced two pay stubs for employment in November 2005 but had not otherwise been employed. She failed to complete individual therapy or domestic violence counseling. She denied needing either despite being involved in relationships with abusive men. She completed and benefited from parenting classes but failed to consistently visit the children. She did not complete mental health services, obtain her GED, or maintain contact with the caseworkers.

The foregoing evidence shows that the trial court did not clearly err in finding termination was appropriate under §§19b(3)(c)(i), (g), and (j). MCR 3.977(G)(3), (J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989). Further, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent-appellant's parental rights was clearly not in the children's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Thus, the trial court did not err in terminating respondent-appellant's parental rights to the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Helene N. White
/s/ Henry William Saad
/s/ Christopher M. Murray