## IN RE CHILD OF JULIE P.

## Submitted on Briefs April 19, 2022 Decided April 28, 2022

Panel: STANFILL, C.J., and MEAD, HUMPHREY, HORTON, and CONNORS, JJ.

## MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Julie P. appeals from a judgment of the District Court (Portland, *Cashman, J.*) terminating her parental rights to her child after a testimonial hearing. Contrary to the mother's contentions, the record contains sufficient competent evidence to support the court's finding that she is unwilling or unable to protect the child from jeopardy within a time reasonably calculated to meet the child's needs, that she is unwilling or unable to take responsibility for the child within a time reasonably calculated to meet the child's needs, and that she failed to make a good faith effort to rehabilitate and reunify with the child. See 22 M.R.S. § 4055(1)(B)(2)(b)(i), (ii), (iv) (2022); In re Child of Christine M., 2018 ME 133, ¶¶ 5-8, 194 A.3d 390. The record also contains sufficient evidence to support the court's finding that the Department undertook reasonable reunification efforts. See In re M.B., 2013 ME 46, ¶¶ 41-43, 65 A.3d 1260.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The mother does not directly challenge the court's determination that termination of her parental rights is in the child's best interest, but she contends that the court should not have reached the issue because the State had not proved parental unfitness by clear and convincing evidence. See 22 M.R.S. § 4055(1)(B)(2)(a) (2022); In re Scott S., 2001 ME 114, ¶¶ 19-21, 775 A.2d 1144. Regardless, no abuse of discretion is evident in the court's best interest determination. See In re Child of Amber D., 2020 ME 30, ¶ 6, 226 A.3d 1157.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

Jason A. MacLean, Esq., Bridgton, for appellant mother

Aaron M. Frey, Attorney General, and Hunter C. Umphrey, Asst. Atty. Gen., Office of the Attorney General, Augusta, for appellee Department of Health and Human Services

Portland District Court docket number PC-2020-48 For Clerk Reference Only