

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of LINCOLN JACQUIN WHITE-GLOVER and LINDSTORM JAVON WHITE-GLOVER, Minors.

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

UNPUBLISHED
July 20, 2006

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

JESSIE WHITE-GLOVER, a/k/a JESSIE MAE
WHITE,

No. 266388
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 04-435184-NA

Respondent-Appellant.

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

MEMORANDUM.

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

Termination of parental rights is appropriate where petitioner proves by clear and convincing evidence at least one ground for termination. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 355; 612 NW2d 407 (2000). Once this has occurred, the trial court shall terminate parental rights unless it finds that the termination is clearly not in the best interests of the children. *Id.* at 353. This Court reviews the trial court's findings under the clearly erroneous standard. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Sours*, 459 Mich 624, 633; 593 NW2d 520 (1999).

The conditions that led to adjudication were respondent's mental illness and environmental neglect. Respondent was offered services, including psychiatric evaluations, therapy, and parenting classes. However, respondent failed to complete the evaluations, did not take her medications, and failed to complete parenting classes. Respondent's failure to address her mental illness supports the finding that the condition that led to adjudication continued to exist, and her denial of her mental illness supports the finding that there was no reasonable likelihood that the condition would be rectified within a reasonable time.

Furthermore, respondent lacked insight into her condition and her need for medication and counseling in order to care for her children. Termination of parental rights is appropriate where the parent's mental illness jeopardizes the children's safety or interferes with the ability to provide proper care. *In re IEM*, 233 Mich App 438, 454; 592 NW2d 751 (1999). Respondent's failure to comply with her treatment plan is evidence of her failure to provide proper care and custody. *In re JK*, 468 Mich 202, 214; 661 NW2d 216 (2003). Respondent's argument that there was no evidence that, given additional time, she could not provide proper care or custody for her children lacks merit given respondent's attitude towards her mental illness. Respondent's denial of her mental illness, her failure to participate in the services to address her mental illness, and her bizarre behavior when she visited the minor children support the finding that respondent's mental illness jeopardized not only the children's emotional well-being, but also their physical safety.

Furthermore, the trial court did not err in its best interests determination, MCL 712A.19b(5), or in terminating respondent's parental rights.

Affirmed.

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