

IN RE HALEY D., et al.

Submitted on Briefs June 15, 2000
Decided June 20, 2000

Panel: WATHEN, C.J., and CLIFFORD, RUDMAN, DANA, SAUFLEY, and
ALEXANDER, JJ.

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

The father appeals from a judgment entered in the District Court (Skowhegan, *Clapp, J.*) terminating his parental rights to Haley, Adam, and Brittany D., pursuant to 22 M.R.S.A. § 4055 (1992 & Supp. 1999). Contrary to his contentions, the record contains sufficient evidence to support the court's findings that the father is unwilling or unable to protect the children from jeopardy, that these circumstances are unlikely to change within a time reasonably calculated to meet the children's needs, and that termination is in the best interest of the children. *See* 22 M.R.S.A. § 4055 (1)(B)(2)(b)(i), (1)(B)(2)(a) (1992 & Supp. 1999). Moreover, the court "could reasonably have been persuaded that the required factual findings were proved to be highly probable." *In re Serena C.*, 650 A.2d 1343, 1344 (Me. 1994) (quoting *In re Jeffrey E.*, 557 A.2d 954, 956 (Me. 1989)). Further, contrary to the father's contention, the record in this case contains sufficient evidence to support the court's finding, in its order relieving the

Department of its obligation to provide reunification services, that the Department made reasonable efforts to rehabilitate and reunify the family.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

Attorney for the appellant:

Douglas D. Hendrick, Esq.
P.O. Box 571
Cornish, Maine 04020

Attorney for the Appellee:

Andrew Ketterer, AG
Matthew Pollack, AAG
Office of Attorney General
State House Station 6
Augusta, Maine 04333

Guardian Ad Litem:

Lori Blaisdell, Esq.
P.O. Box 250
Madison, Maine 04950-0250