

IN RE CHILDREN OF JULIANNA G.

Argued June 6, 2022  
Decided June 28, 2022

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

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Julianna G. appeals from a judgment of the District Court (Bangor, *Campbell, J.*) terminating her parental rights as to two of her four children.<sup>1</sup> Contrary to the mother's contention, and despite the progress she has made, we determine that the record contains sufficient evidence supporting the trial court's finding of parental unfitness based primarily on her inability to recognize unsafe people or relationships. *See In re Danielle S.*, 2004 ME 19, ¶ 4, 884 A.2d 1148 (stating that a finding of jeopardy as to one child can be based on evidence of a parent's actions toward another child); *In re Child of Kimberlee C.*, 2018 ME 134, ¶ 5, 194 A.3d 925 ("Deference is paid to the District Court's superior perspective for evaluating the weight and credibility of evidence." (alteration and quotation marks omitted)); *see also Friends of Lincoln Lakes v. Bd. Of Env't Prot.*, 2010 ME 18, ¶ 13, 989 A.2d 1128 ("We must affirm findings of fact if they are supported by substantial evidence in the record, even

---

<sup>1</sup> The District Court terminated the mother's parental rights as to the two children here in an order entered January 13, 2022. We scheduled a consolidated oral argument for this appeal, Pen-22-10, and a separate appeal, Pen-21-162, in which the mother challenged a separate termination order as to her two other children.

if the record contains inconsistent evidence or evidence contrary to the result reached by the agency.”<sup>2</sup>).

Furthermore, the court did not abuse its discretion when it determined that termination of the mother’s parental rights was in her children’s best interest. *See In re C.P.*, 2013 ME 57, ¶ 19, 67 A.3d 558 (“[W]here the only real hope for children is to be placed in a healthy, supportive, and permanent adoptive home, the court does not err or abuse its discretion in finding termination to be in the best interests of the children, even if the possibility of adoption is less than certain.”).

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

---

Erik T. Crocker, Esq. (orally), Farrell, Rosenblatt & Russell, Bangor, for appellant mother

Aaron M. Frey, Attorney General, Julia Teitel, Asst. Atty. Gen., and Hunter Umphrey, Asst. Atty. Gen. (orally), Office of the Attorney General, Augusta, for appellee Department of Health and Human Services

Bangor District Court docket numbers PC-2018-135 and PC-2019-122  
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY

---

<sup>2</sup> “The substantial evidence standard of review is equated to the clear error standard used in review of fact-findings by a trial court.” Alexander, *Maine Appellate Practice* § 458(c) at 407 (5th ed. 2018); *Town of Eddington v. Emera Maine*, 2017 ME 225, ¶ 14, 174 A.3d 321.