

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of MICHAEL ANTHONY DARREL  
JORDAN, LAQISHA ANTRANETTE  
SHARRELL JORDAN, JESSIKA JEANISE  
JORDAN, and DE'NIRO MARTINAZE JHONS,  
JR., Minors.

---

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,  
  
Petitioner-Appellee,

UNPUBLISHED  
December 16, 2004

v

LAKISHA NICOLE JORDAN, a/k/a LAKISHA  
N. JORDAN,

No. 256028  
Wayne Circuit Court  
Family Division  
LC No. 99-384283

Respondent-Appellant.

---

Before: Markey, P.J., and Fitzgerald and Owens, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

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

The trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory ground for termination under MCL 712A.19b(3)(g) was established by clear and convincing evidence. MCR 3.977(J); *In re Miller*, 433 Mich 331, 337; 445 NW2d 161 (1989).<sup>1</sup> Section 19b(3)(g) permits termination when the parent, without regard to intent, fails to provide proper care or custody for the child and there is no reasonable expectation that the parent will be able to provide proper care and custody within a reasonable time considering the child's age. Respondent admitted the allegations in the initial petition, which alleged that she left her children without proper care. The evidence clearly demonstrated that respondent failed to comply with the case treatment plan. Significantly,

---

<sup>1</sup> Termination under MCL 712A.19b(3)(c)(i) was an error, because 182 days had not elapsed between the initial dispositional order (November 3, 2003) and the date the petition was filed (April 6, 2004). However, only one statutory ground is required to terminate parental rights. See *In re Powers*, 244 Mich App 111, 118; 624 NW2d 472 (2000).

respondent failed to complete substance abuse treatment, which was the cornerstone of the case treatment plan. At the permanent custody hearing, respondent continued to deny that she had a substance abuse problem. She also failed to complete parenting classes, had no income other than that provided by her boyfriend, did not consistently visit the children, and never provided the caseworker with information regarding her housing situation.

Furthermore, the evidence did not show that termination of respondent'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's parental rights to the children.

Affirmed.

/s/ Jane E. Markey  
/s/ E. Thomas Fitzgerald  
/s/ Donald S. Owens