

J.B.1, the court found pursuant to R.C. 2151.414(B)(1)(d) that the child had been in temporary custody for more than 12 months of a consecutive 22-month period when HCJFS filed its motion for permanent custody. In addition, the court found that the children could not be placed with either parent within a reasonable time or should not be placed with their parents. *See* R.C. 2151.414(B)(1)(a). This finding required the court to determine by clear and convincing evidence that one or more of the factors in R.C. 2151.414(E) existed as to each parent.

The record contains sufficient evidence to support the juvenile court's finding under R.C. 2151.414(E) that the children cannot be placed with either parent within a reasonable time and should not be placed with either parent. *See In re W.W.* at ¶ 46. Both parents failed continuously and repeatedly to substantially remedy the conditions that caused the children to be placed outside the home. *See* R.C. 2151.414(E)(1). Both parents suffer from chronic mental illness, and father suffers from chronic substance abuse, which prevented the court from safely placing the children with either of them within a reasonable time. *See* R.C. 2151.414(E)(2). In addition, the parents continued to maintain their abusive relationship despite their history of domestic violence.

Father did not engage in mental-health or substance-abuse treatment, nor did he complete an anger-management program, all as required by his case plan. He did not submit to drug screening, and reported that he continued to use marijuana and crack. Although mother completed a required domestic-violence course, she refused to make behavioral changes and continued to engage in aggressive behavior. Mother was discharged unsuccessfully from a parenting course because she failed to attend the coaching component of the course. Although mother had recently obtained housing, her caseworker had not been able to locate her or father for a two-month period after J.B.2's birth.

In addition, we conclude that the juvenile court did not err in determining that an award of permanent custody to HCJFS was in the children's best interest. The court considered that the GAL supported an award of permanent custody; that J.B.1 had been in agency custody for nearly two years, and that J.B.2 had been in agency custody since his birth in September 2016; and that the children needed a legally secure permanent placement. *See* R.C. 2151.414(D)(1)(b)-(d). In addition, the court considered that father had not visited or otherwise supported the children, and that mother, who had recently begun to regularly visit the children, had failed to progress beyond the highest level of supervision for visitation. The court also found that the children had made a positive adjustment to their foster parents who expressed interest in adopting them. *See* R.C. 2151.414(D)(1)(a).

After reviewing the record, we hold that the court's findings as to the R.C. 2151.414(B)(1)(a) and (d) factors, and as to the best-interest factors in R.C. 2151.414(D)(1) were supported by sufficient evidence and were not against the manifest weight of the evidence. *See In re C.F.*, 1st Dist. Hamilton Nos. C-150454 and C-150469, 2015-Ohio-4706, ¶ 12. Therefore, we hold that competent and credible evidence supported the juvenile court's award of permanent custody to HCJFS. *See In re W.W.*, 1st Dist. Hamilton Nos. C-110363 and C-110402, 2011-Ohio-4912, at ¶ 48. We overrule the assignments of error and affirm the juvenile court's judgment.

Further, a certified copy of this judgment entry shall be sent to the trial court under App.R. 27. Costs shall be taxed under App.R. 24.

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

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on May 18, 2018

per order of the court _____
Presiding Judge