



Mother does not challenge the trial court's finding pursuant to R.C. 2151.414(B)(1)(d) that the children had been in temporary custody for more than 12 months of a consecutive 22-month period when the GAL filed her motion for permanent custody. Although not required to do so because the "12 of 22" condition had been met, the trial court also determined pursuant to R.C. 2151.414(B)(1)(a) that the children could not be placed with either of their parents within a reasonable time or should not be placed with their parents.

The court's finding under R.C. 2151.414(B)(1)(a) required the court to determine by clear and convincing evidence that one or more of the factors in R.C. 2151.414(E) existed. The record contains sufficient evidence to support the juvenile court's findings that although mother had completed case-plan services, she failed to substantially remedy the conditions that caused the children to be removed from her home, and that mother's intellectual disability prevented her from being able to provide an adequate permanent home for the children. *See* R.C. 2151.414(E)(1) and (E)(2). In addition, mother was convicted of felony child endangering for scalding her two-year-old child. *See* R.C. 2151.414(E)(6).

We also 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 the children had been in agency custody for nearly two years; and that the children needed a legally secure permanent placement that could not be achieved without a grant of permanent custody. *See* R.C. 2151.414(D)(1)(b)-(d). In addition, the court considered that mother had failed to progress beyond the highest level of supervision for her weekly visitation with the children. The court also found that the children had bonded well with each other and with their foster parent. *See* R.C. 2151.414(D)(1)(a).

**OHIO FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS**

---

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.

**MOCK, P.J., ZAYAS and MYERS, JJ.**

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on April 10, 2019

per order of the court \_\_\_\_\_  
Presiding Judge