

We also note that mother does not have standing to argue that the juvenile court erred in failing to grant the maternal grandmother's petition for custody of the child, particularly given that the maternal grandmother never appealed the denial of her petition. See *In re K.C.*, 2017-Ohio-8383, 99 N.E.3d 1061, ¶ 6-13 (1st Dist.); *In re T.W.*, 1st Dist. Hamilton No. C-130080, 2013-Ohio-1754, ¶ 3-9. Consequently, we address mother's assignment of error only as it pertains to the termination of her parental rights.

R.C. 2151.414(B) provides that a juvenile court may grant permanent custody of a child to a public children-services agency if it finds by clear and convincing evidence that (1) permanent custody is in the best interest of the child and (2) that one of the five conditions in R.C. 2151.414(B)(1)(a) through (e) applies. *In re J.G.S.*, 1st Dist. Hamilton Nos. C-180611 and C-180619, 2019-Ohio-802, ¶ 34. Clear and convincing evidence supported the juvenile court's finding that the 12-of-22 rule applied. Therefore, the condition in R.C. 2151.414(B)(1)(d) was met.

The only issue remaining, then, was whether granting permanent custody of W.T. to HCJFS was in the child's best interest. *In re J.G.S.* at ¶ 38; *In re L.W.J.*, 1st Dist. Hamilton Nos. C-140382 and C-140283, 2014-Ohio-4181, ¶ 26. The evidence showed that mother had received substance-abuse treatment as required by the case plan. But the dispositive issue is not whether the parent has complied with the case plan, but whether the parent has substantially remedied the conditions that led to the child's removal. *In re J.G.S.* at ¶ 39; *In re M., R., & H. Children*, 1st Dist. Hamilton No. C-170008, 2017-Ohio-1431, ¶ 22. The record shows that mother's sobriety was fragile, and that she was not ready to care for the child. The record also shows that the child was thriving in his foster home, and that he was bonded with his foster family, who wished to adopt him.

OHIO FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS

The record shows that the juvenile court properly considered the factors set forth in R.C. 2151.414(D) and (E). *See In re M., R., & H. Children* at ¶ 23 and 24. Clear and convincing evidence supported the juvenile court’s determination that granting permanent custody to HCJFS was in the child’s best interest. Therefore, the evidence was sufficient to support the award of permanent custody. *See id.* at ¶ 17 and 27; *In re A.B.*, 1st Dist. Hamilton Nos. C-150307 and C-150310, 2015-Ohio-3247, ¶ 15.

Further, after reviewing the record, we cannot say that the juvenile court lost its way and created such a miscarriage of justice that we must reverse the judgment and order a new trial. Therefore, the judgment was not against the manifest weight of the evidence. *See Eastley v. Volkmann*, 132 Ohio St.3d 328, 2012-Ohio-2179, 972 N.E.2d 517, ¶ 12; *In re A.B.* at ¶ 16. We overrule mother’s sole assignment of error and affirm the juvenile 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.

MOCK, P.J., ZAYAS and CROUSE, JJ.

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on August 23, 2019
per order of the court _____.
Presiding Judge