

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of CHARLES JOSEPH RAAD,
Minor.

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

UNPUBLISHED
July 25, 2006

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

ANNETTE MARIE RAAD,

Respondent-Appellant.

No. 265718
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 90-286024-NA

Before: Neff, P.J., and Bandstra and Zahra, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right the trial court's order terminating her parental rights to the minor child under MCL 712A.19b(3)(a)(ii), (c)(i), (g), and (j). We affirm.

Respondent challenges only the trial court's best interests determination. The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the evidence did not establish that termination of respondent's parental rights was clearly not in the child's best interests. MCL 712A.19b(5); *In re Trejo, Minors*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Respondent was the subject of protective services involvement for 19 years, during which time the minor child was a temporary court ward from 1990 to 1993 and from 1997 to 2005. The trial court conducted two termination hearings and determined at the March 2000 hearing that, although statutory grounds to terminate respondent's parental rights were clearly established, termination was not in the 10-year-old child's best interests because of the prospect of respondent parenting him jointly with the maternal grandmother.

At the 2005 hearing, respondent had not complied with her treatment plan for two years and had moved out of state, and it was clear that neither respondent nor other relatives were willing or able to parent the minor child. In addition, the child was now 16 years old, desired the opportunity to be adopted, and requested termination of respondent's parental rights. The termination order did not sever the family bond. Rather, respondent effectively severed the bond with the minor child two years before the termination hearing by abandoning him and

relinquishing her attempt to regain custody. The termination order resulted in no detriment to the minor child, but only the benefit of possible permanence.

We affirm.

/s/ Janet T. Neff
/s/ Richard A. Bandstra
/s/ Brian K. Zahra