

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

In the Matter of RONALD CARL GRIHORASH,
Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

RONALD CARL MOORE,

Respondent-Appellant

and

ERIN FAYE GRIHORASH,

Respondent.

In the Matter of RONALD CARL GRIHORASH,
Minor.

FAMILY INDEPENDENCE AGENCY,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

ERIN FAYE GRIHORASH,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

RONALD CARL MOORE,

Respondent.

UNPUBLISHED
February 15, 2005

No. 256997
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 99-376379-NA

No. 256998
Wayne Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 99-376379-NA

Before: Talbot, P.J., Whitbeck, C.J., and Jansen, J.

PER CURIAM.

In these consolidated appeals, respondent father appeals as of right from the trial court order terminating his parental rights to the minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(g) and (j), and respondent mother appeals as of right from the same order terminating her parental rights to the minor child pursuant to MCL 712A.19b(3)(g), (j), and (l). We affirm.

The trial court did not clearly err in determining that the statutory grounds had been established by clear and convincing evidence. *In re Trejo*, 462 Mich 341, 356-357; 612 NW2d 407 (2000); *In re McIntyre*, 192 Mich App 47, 50; 480 NW2d 293 (1991).

This case commenced shortly after the birth of the minor child because petitioner was concerned about respondent mother's ability to care for the child given her mental health history and because her parental rights to another child had previously been terminated. At the time the minor child was taken into care, respondent father was an involuntary patient at a psychiatric hospital after having been found not guilty by reason of insanity in a criminal car jacking case. Respondent mother moved to Louisiana shortly after the minor child was taken from her care and lived with the minor child's paternal grandmother. Respondent mother visited with the minor child three times during the course of the proceedings. Respondent mother had an extensive mental health history with at least four involuntary admissions into an inpatient psychiatric facility. She had her rights to another child terminated previously because she was an inpatient in a mental health facility and unable to care for the child. The court relied on a psychological evaluation done by the court's Clinic for Child Study. The psychologist stated that, because of respondent mother's history of multiple psychiatric hospitalizations, her impulsivity, her passive/dependent nature and her lack of knowledge of appropriate parenting techniques, she could not safely care for the minor child. Moreover, the likelihood that she would be able to care for the minor child within a reasonable time was poor. Accordingly, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination of respondent mother's parental rights had been established. Moreover, the court also properly found that the paternal grandmother could not be relied on to provide the necessary support because she was on probation for possession of cocaine.

Respondent father did not comply with any of conditions imposed upon him. He did not visit the minor child consistently and had not seen the minor child in a year. He did not comply with the terms of his Authorized Leave Status Contract with the psychiatric hospital, which was a condition of the finding that he was not guilty of the car jacking charge. He left the facility he was living in and did not provide a way to be contacted. He continued to abuse drugs, tested positive for cocaine on three out of four drug screens that he provided, and did not consistently comply with the requirements of providing screens. Accordingly, the trial court did not clearly err in finding that the statutory grounds for termination of respondent father's parental rights had

been established.

Affirmed.

/s/ Michael J. Talbot
/s/ William C. Whitbeck
/s/ Kathleen Jansen