

OHIO FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS

1764, ¶ 19-20; *In re C.G.*, 9th Dist. Summit Nos. 24099 and 24097, 2008-Ohio-3773, ¶ 7.

None of the three criteria was shown by clear and convincing evidence. Mother had not made much progress remedying the problems described in the case plan, there was not reasonable cause to believe that any of the children could be reunified with mother during the extension period, and an extension was not in the children's best interest. Consequently, the trial court did not err in denying mother's motion for an extension of temporary custody.

Next, mother argues that clear and convincing evidence did not support the trial court's decision to award permanent custody of the children to HCJFS. The record shows that clear and convincing evidence supported the trial court's determination that the children could not or should be placed with one of their parents within a reasonable time, and that a grant of permanent custody was in the children's best interest. *See* R.C. 2151.414(B); *In re M., R., & H. Children*, 1st Dist. Hamilton No. C-170008, 2017-Ohio-1431, ¶ 17. Therefore, the evidence was sufficient to support an award of permanent custody to HCJFS. *See In re A.B.*, 1st Dist. Hamilton Nos. C-150307 and C-150310, 2015-Ohio-3247, ¶ 15. We overrule mother's sole assignment of error and affirm the trial court's judgment.

A certified copy of this judgment entry constitutes the mandate, which shall be sent to the trial court under App.R. 27. Costs shall be taxed under App.R. 24.

CUNNINGHAM, P.J., MYERS and DETERS, JJ.

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on March 30, 2018
per order of the court _____.
Presiding Judge