

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of MISTY WILSON and JANET
WILSON, Minors.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN SERVICES,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

CHARLES WILSON,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

May 13, 2008

No. 280529

Oakland Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 06-718130-NA

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

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from an order terminating his parental rights to his minor children pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(g). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in determining that the statutory ground for termination had been established by clear and convincing evidence or in its determination of the children's best interests. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 353-354; 612 NW2d 407 (2000); *In re Sours*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999). Respondent failed to protect the minor children from the neglectful circumstances that they lived in with their mother, had a significant arrearage in child support, failed to comply with the parent-agency agreement, including failing to complete the substance abuse assessment and failing to complete parenting classes, and did not visit with the minor children after the successful visit in August 2006. While the trial court acknowledged it was a difficult situation because the teenaged minor children did not want to be involved with respondent, the trial court correctly placed the responsibility to work on the relationship on respondent because he was the parent. Respondent's failure to make any effort to comply over such a long period of time was sufficient for the trial court to find that there was no reasonable likelihood of change in the foreseeable future.

Respondent argues that there were too many workers and respondent did not know whom to contact. However, at one of the review hearings, the trial court made sure respondent knew whom he should contact. Respondent argues that petitioner should have contacted the minor children and determined what their wishes were regarding termination. However, respondent had not done anything to show the court that he was willing to do what it took to have the minor

children in his care and custody. He did not even attend the termination and best interests hearings. Respondent cannot now blame petitioner for his failure to make the required effort.

The minor children were raised in a chaotic and unstable environment and needed a safe, nurturing, and stable environment. Respondent had not shown any interest in the minor children before the court involvement and did not make any efforts to show the court that he cared enough about the minor children and could provide them with a loving, stable home. While the minor children were 16 and 17 years old, and it was unlikely that they would be adopted, respondent did not show that he could provide the environment that the minor children needed.

Affirmed.

/s/ Pat M. Donofrio

/s/ David H. Sawyer

/s/ William B. Murphy