

**IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LYCOMING COUNTY,
PENNSYLVANIA
ORPHANS' COURT DIVISION**

IN RE: : **NO. 2022-6783**
:
HB, :
:
Minor child :

OPINION AND ORDER

AND NOW, this 11th day of **May, 2022**, before the Court is Lycoming County Children & Youth Services' ("Agency") Petition for Involuntary Termination of Parental Rights of DB ("Mother") filed on January 26, 2022, with regard to HB ("Child"). A hearing on the Petition for Involuntary Termination of Parental Rights was held on May 3, 2022. John Pietrovito, Esquire, Solicitor for the Agency, and Angela Lovecchio, Esquire, counsel for the Child, were present at the hearing. Jessica Feese, Esquire, appeared on behalf of Mother. Mother, despite being properly served with notice of the hearing, failed to appear. TB ("Father") signed a Consent to Adopt on January 21, 2022, and was not present at the hearings.

Findings of Facts

HB was born on [redacted]. She is the child of TB, date of birth [redacted], and DB, date of birth [redacted]. Mother and Father were married at the time of the Child's birth. Mother has an extensive history of drug abuse. Mother has five (5) children in addition to the Child in this case, none of whom are in her custody. Her parental rights to at least two (2) other children have been terminated. Mother was incarcerated at the time of the Child's birth and remained incarcerated until the Child was approximately

eight months old. After the Child's birth, she was released from the hospital to the home of Blandy Campbell, who is Mother's stepfather and the proposed adopter.

The Agency became involved with the family on October 27, 2020. Mother's Probation Officer, LE, had transported Mother and Child to the Pennsylvania State Police Barracks due to concerns about her erratic behavior and allegations of sexual abuse against BC. LE testified that he believed Mother was under the influence of an illegal substance, which she eventually admitted to be methamphetamines. The Agency arrived at the barracks, but Mother was uncooperative with both the Agency worker and LE. Due to her behaviors and admitted drug use, Mother was incarcerated on October 27, 2020, for a probation violation. BC was unable to be a resource for the Child at the time due to Mother's allegations against him, and Mother was unable to identify any possible resources for the Child so the Agency was verbally granted emergency custody of the Child on that date and the Child was placed in the [redacted] resource home.

The Agency filed a Dependency Petition and a hearing was held on November 5, 2020, after which the Court adjudicated the Child dependent. As the Court found that allowing the Child to remain in the home of Mother would be contrary to the Child's welfare, legal and physical custody of the Child was to remain with the Agency and the Child was to remain the approved resource home.

On January 6, 2021, the Court entered an Order finding aggravated circumstances with regard to Mother due to the fact that her parental rights to another child had previously been involuntarily terminated. The Court further Ordered that no efforts were to be made to preserve the family and reunify the Child with Mother, as she had been involved with the Agency previously and was aware of what she needed to do

in order to be an appropriate caregiver for her Child. The Agency was directed, however, to continue to facilitate supervised visits between Mother and the Child. The Court made it clear to Mother that it was her responsibility to take all steps necessary to ensure that she was addressing any drug & alcohol issues, housing issues, and mental health issues, and that she was expected to provide evidence of her efforts at each permanency review hearing.

A permanency review hearing was started on February 10, 2021, and concluded on March 15, 2021. After the first day of testimony on February 10, 2021, the Child was placed in the custody of BC, as the Agency's investigation into Mother's allegations against him had concluded and been deemed unfounded. The Court noted that there had been moderate compliance with the permanency plan and moderate progress towards alleviating the conditions which necessitated placement. During the review period, Mother began outpatient treatment at Crossroads Counseling to address drug and alcohol concerns and began working with a recovery specialist. She also began working with a mental health team at Crossroads Counseling. She sent letters to the Child while incarcerated and visited regularly. However, during the review period, Mother lost two jobs and subsequently, upon the advice of her recovery specialist, focused on her recovery and not employment. Although Mother visited regularly, at times her mental health interfered with the visits and she was unable to manage her emotions. Due to her behaviors, the Agency requested that Mother's visits be reduced to the statutory minimum of one hour every other week. Mother displayed the same behaviors in court at the hearing that she exhibited at the visits, and although the Court found Mother's outbursts to be inappropriate, it denied both the Agency's request to reduce the visits and to change the goal from reunification to adoption. The Court's

Order provided Mother with a list of 8 things that she was to do during the following review period and authorized the Agency to request Mother participate in random drug screens and indicated that her refusal to do so would be considered by the Court as a positive result. Following the hearing, the Child remained in the legal and physical custody of the Agency with continued placement in the home of her step-grandfather, BC.

A permanency review hearing was held on June 18, 2021. The Court found that Mother had minimal compliance with the permanency plan and made no progress towards alleviating the circumstances which necessitated the original placement. During the review period, Mother was discharged from all services at Crossroads Counseling. Mother relapsed and voluntarily signed herself into in-patient drug and alcohol treatment on May 17, 2021, but left the facility against medical advice before completing treatment. Mother attended 15 out of 18 visits during the review period but did not attend any of the Child's medical appointments. Mother was referred to Outreach Services and attended 1 out of 2 scheduled appointments, but was reported to be difficult when the Outreach worker attempted to schedule additional appointments.

Mother failed at all 8 of the items she was specifically court-ordered to address during this review period. She was incarcerated and had her probation revoked. She was resentenced to a max-out sentence, which meant that when she was released she would have no services in place and would have to start those again on her own. The Agency again sought to reduce visitation and change the goal from reunification to adoption. The Court denied the Agency's request to change the goal to adoption but was very direct with Mother about her obligation to follow through with what was

previously ordered if she wanted to have any chance of being reunified with the Child. The Court granted the Agency's request to reduce Mother's visits to 1 hour per week and cautioned Mother that she must control her emotions during the visits. Following the hearing, the Court reaffirmed dependency and legal and physical custody of the Child remained with the Agency for continued placement in her current placement.

A permanency review hearing was held on October 1, 2021, which Mother failed to attend. The Court found that Mother had no compliance with the permanency plan and made no progress towards alleviating the circumstances which necessitated the original placement. During the review period, Mother was incarcerated from June 9, 2021 to August 17, 2021, and did not re-initiate drug and alcohol or mental health services following her release. Mother did not meet with Outreach services during the review period. Mother did maintain housing but not employment during the review period. Mother attended 7 out of 9 visits while incarcerated but only one after her release, and was placed on "call-in" status. The Guardian Ad Litem proposed that the visits be reduced to the statutory minimum of one hour every other week. As Mother did not attend the hearing, her attorney did not object and the visits were reduced. Following the hearing, the Court reaffirmed dependency and legal and physical custody of the Child remained with the Agency for continued placement in her current resource home.

A permanency review hearing was held on January 4, 2022. The Court found that Mother had no compliance with the permanency plan and made no progress towards alleviating the circumstances which necessitated the original placement. During the review period, Mother was not involved in any programs or services to address her drug and alcohol or mental health concerns. Mother continued to be

unemployed, lost her housing, and was couch surfing. Mother attended only 1 out of 5 visits and no-showed the rest. On December 10, 2021, Mother was incarcerated on a Domestic Relations bench warrant. Mother attended the hearing via Polycom and was warned several times to stop interrupting or she would be muted. Mother's interruptions were not for a valid reason but were rants or yelling. Mother continued her behaviors and the Court had to mute her. Mother could still hear the proceedings but the Court could not hear her. Following the hearing, the Court reaffirmed dependency and legal and physical custody of the Child remained with the Agency for continued placement in her current resource home.

The Agency filed a Petition for Involuntary Termination of Parental Rights on January 26, 2022. A Petition for Change of Goal to Adoption was also filed on January 26, 2022. The Petition for Involuntary Termination alleged termination was warranted under 23 Pa.C.S. §2511(a)(1), (2), (5), and (8). The hearing on the Petition was held on May 3, 2022.

Discussion

The Agency argues that the basis for termination in this case may be found in 23 Pa.C.S. §2511(a)(1), (2), (5) and (8), which provides as follows:

§2511. Grounds for Involuntary Termination

(a) GENERAL RULE.--The rights of a parent in regard to a child may be terminated after a petition filed on any of the following grounds:

- (1) The parent by conduct continuing for a period of at least six months immediately preceding the filing of the petition either has evidenced a settled purpose of relinquishing parental claim to a child or has refused or failed to perform parental duties.
- (2) The repeated and continued incapacity, abuse, neglect or refusal of the parent has caused the child to be without essential parental care, control or subsistence necessary for his physical or mental well-being

and the conditions and causes of the incapacity, abuse, neglect or refusal cannot or will not be remedied by the parent.

- (5) The child has been removed from the care of the parent by the court or under a voluntary agreement with an agency for a period of at least six months, the conditions which led to the removal or placement of the child continue to exist, the parent cannot or will not remedy those conditions within a reasonable period of time, the services or assistance reasonably available to the parent are not likely to remedy the conditions which led to the removal or placement of the child within a reasonable period of time and termination of the parental rights would best serve the needs and welfare of the child.
- (8) The child has been removed from the care of the parent by the court or under a voluntary agreement with an agency, 12 months or more have elapsed from the date of removal or placement, the conditions which led to the removal or placement of the child continue to exist and termination of parental rights would best serve the needs and welfare of the child.

In order to involuntarily terminate Mother's parental rights, the Agency must prove by clear and convincing evidence one of the above subsections of 23 Pa.C.S. §2511(a).

A court may terminate parental rights under Section 2511(a)(1) where a parent demonstrates a settled purpose to relinquish parental claim to a child or fails to perform parental duties for at least six months prior to the filing of the termination petition. **In the Interest of C.S.**, 761 A.2d 1197, 1201 (Pa. Super. 2000) (emphasis added). The Court should consider the entire background of the case and not simply:

mechanically apply the six month statutory provision. The court must examine the individual circumstances of each case and consider all explanations offered by the parent facing termination of his . . . parental rights, to determine if the evidence, in light of the totality of the circumstances, clearly warrants the involuntary termination.

In re: B.N.M., 856 A.2d 847, 855 (Pa. Super. 2004), appeal denied, 872 A.2d 1200 (Pa. 2005) citing **In re: D.J.S.**, 737 A.2d 283, 286 (Pa. Super. 1999).

Grounds for termination under 23 Pa.C.S. 2511(a)(1) may be proven where a parent fails to perform parental duties for a period in excess of six months prior to the filing of the Petition for Involuntary Termination of Parental Rights.

In determining what constitutes parental duties, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court has said:

There is no simple or easy definition of parental duties. Parental duty is best understood in relation to the needs of a child. A child needs love, protection, guidance, and support. These needs, physical and emotional, cannot be met by a merely passive interest in the development of the child. Thus, this Court has held that the parental obligation is a positive duty which requires affirmative performance. This affirmative duty encompasses more than a financial obligation; it requires continuing interest in the child and a genuine effort to maintain communication and association with the child. Because a child needs more than a benefactor, parental duty requires that a parent "exert himself to take and maintain a place of importance in the child's life."

With these principles in mind, the question whether a parent has failed or refused to perform parental duties must be analyzed in relation to the particular circumstances of the case. A finding of abandonment, which has been characterized as "one of the most severe steps the court can take," will not be predicated upon parental conduct which is reasonably explained or which resulted from circumstances beyond the parent's control. It may only result when a parent has failed to utilize all available resources to preserve the parental relationship.

In re: Burns, 379 A.2d 535, 540 (Pa. 1977) (citations omitted). The Child was removed from Mother's care on October 27, 2020, and placed in her current resource home on February 10, 2021. Given her young age, the Child's greatest needs have been food, shelter, clothing, medical care, and comfort. In order to satisfy her obligation to perform parental duties, Mother would have to provide stable housing, make and attend medical appointments, provide financial support for the Child, and comfort her when she was sick or scared. The Child was removed from Mother's care because she was not performing these parental duties adequately and consistently enough to ensure her safety. Since she has been in care, Mother's performance of parental duties has been limited to – at best – 1 hour per week and currently 1 hour every other week while

attending visitation at the Agency. Heather Wood testified that Mother had very poor attendance at scheduled visitation when she was not incarcerated and that she made no progress on her goals. As Mother's visits have not progressed beyond the "supervised" status, and they have been reduced twice by the Court, Mother cannot be said to have performed any parental duties sufficient to meet the basic physical, emotional, and social needs of the Child.

Additionally, Mother's failure to attend the hearing on the Petition for Involuntary Termination of Parental Rights demonstrates a settled purpose to relinquish her parental claim to the Child. The Court hereby finds by clear and convincing evidence that the Agency has fulfilled the requirements of 23 Pa.C.S. §2511(a)(1) in that Mother has failed to perform her parental duties for at least six months prior to the filing of the termination petition and that she demonstrated a settled purpose to relinquish her parental claim to the Child.

To satisfy the requirements of Section 2511(a)(2), the Agency must demonstrate that Mother, through:

(1) [R]epeated and continued incapacity, abuse, neglect or refusal; (2) such incapacity, abuse, neglect or refusal has caused the child to be without essential parental care, control or subsistence necessary for his physical or mental well-being; and (3) the causes of the incapacity, abuse, neglect or refusal cannot or will not be remedied.

In re: Adoption of M.E.P., 825 A.2d 1266, 1272 (Pa. Super. 2003.)

Under Section 2511(a)(2), "[t]he grounds for termination [of parental rights] due to parental incapacity that cannot be remedied are not limited to affirmative misconduct. To the contrary, those grounds may include acts of refusal as well as incapacity to perform parental duties." **In re: A.L.D.**, 797 A.2d 326, 337 (Pa. Super. 2002) (citations omitted). "Moreover, an agency is not required to

provide services indefinitely if a parent is either unable or unwilling to apply the instruction given.” Id. at 340. “Parents are required to make diligent efforts towards the reasonably prompt assumption of full parental responsibilities. ... [A] parent’s vow to cooperate, after a long period of uncooperativeness regarding the necessity or availability of services, may properly be rejected as untimely or disingenuous.” Id., quoting In re J.W., 578 A.2d 952, 959 (Pa. Super. 1990).

At each of the permanency review hearings, the Court found that Mother had minimal or no compliance with the permanency plan and had made minimal or no progress towards alleviating the circumstances which necessitated placement. “When a child is in foster care, this affirmative duty requires the parent to work towards the return of the child by cooperating with the Agency to obtain rehabilitative services necessary for them to be capable of performing their parental duties and responsibilities.” In re: G.P.-R., 851 A.2d 967, 977 (Pa.Super. 2004).

Greg Williams, Outreach Services caseworker for the Agency, testified that Mother was referred for services on April 1, 2021. The initial goal was for support, but he later added budgeting and parenting classes. Mother declined parenting services and indicated that she was taking classes at Expectations Womens’ Center. Mr. Williams testified that Mother was not employed and had no income so there was no way for him to assist her with preparing a budget. Mr. Williams prepared two reports (Ex. 12, 13), which stated that Mother met with him one time and the case was closed on October 19, 2021, due to Mother’s non-compliance. Mr. Williams testified that any time Mother wished to reinstate

services, all she needed to do was contact him but he has had no communication with her.

Pam Burkholder, the Executive Director of Expectations Womens' Center, testified that Mother's first time in their office was February 2, 2021. Mother did a combination of video lessons and in-person sessions to work on building values and character as well as meeting the emotional needs of a child. However, the last time anyone at Expectations had contact with Mother was April 27, 2021, less than 3 months after she began services with them.

Mother has struggled with drug and alcohol issues and mental health concerns for the duration of the time she has been involved with the Agency. Mother was discharged from services at Crossroads Counseling in May of 2021, and left in-patient treatment at White Deer Run against medical advice. Heidi Porter, Ongoing Services caseworker at the Agency, testified that Mother has never signed a release for her to receive any information from treatment providers but to her knowledge, Mother is not currently receiving any services to address her needs.

The Child has been in placement nearly 18 months, and Mother has not been able to make significant progress in addressing the incapacities which caused the Child to be removed from her care. Given Mother's past history and her continued inability to follow-through with actions necessary to address her own needs while simultaneously ensuring that the Child's needs are met consistently and appropriately, this Court finds that she has not remedied these incapacities within a reasonable amount of time and will likely be unable to remedy them in the future. This Court is unwilling to further delay the Child's

permanency based on Mother's intention to be an appropriate resource for the Child in the future. The Court finds by clear and convincing evidence that the Agency has fulfilled 23 Pa.C.S. §2511(a)(2) by demonstrating Mothers repeated and continued incapacity has caused the Child to be without essential parental control or subsistence necessary for her physical and mental well-being.

"Termination of parental rights under Pa.C.S. § 2511(a)(5) requires that: (1) the child has been removed from parental care for at least six months; (2) the conditions which led to removal and placement of the child continue to exist; and (3) termination of parental rights would best serve the needs and welfare of the child." **In re: K.J.**, 936 A.2d 1128, 1134 (Pa. Super. 2007).

Similarly, to terminate parental rights pursuant to 23 Pa.C.S. § 2511(a)(8), the following factors must be demonstrated: "(1) [t]he child has been removed from parental care for 12 months or more from the date of removal; (2) the conditions which led to the removal or placement of the child continue to exist; and (3) termination of parental rights would best serve the needs and welfare of the child." **In re: Adoption of M.E.P.**, 825 A.2d 1266, 1275-76 (Pa. Super. 2003). "Section 2511(a)(8) sets a 12-month time frame for a parent to remedy the conditions that led to the children's removal by the court." **In re: A.R.**, 837 A.2d 560, 564 (Pa. Super. 2003). After the 12-month period has been established, the Court must next determine whether the conditions necessitating placement persist, despite the reasonable good faith efforts that the agency supplied over a realistic time period. **Id.** In terminating parental rights under Section 2511(a)(8), the trial court is not required to evaluate a parent's current "willingness or ability to remedy the conditions that initially caused placement". **In re: Adoption of**

T.B.B., 835 A.2d at 396 (Pa. Super. 2003); **In re: Adoption of M.E.P.**, 825 A.2d at 1276.

The Court finds that the Agency has proven by clear and convincing evidence that grounds for termination of Mother's parental rights exist under both Sections 2511(a)(5) and (8). The Child was removed from the home and placed in the legal and physical custody of the Agency on October 27, 2020, and has been in Agency's custody ever since. The Child had been removed from her Mother's care for approximately 15 months at the time of the filing of the Petition for Involuntary Termination of Parental Rights. At each of the permanency review hearings for the Child, Mother was found to have minimal to no compliance with the permanency plan and made no substantial progress towards alleviating the conditions which necessitated the Child's placement. As described above, Mother continues to experience the same difficulties meeting both her and the Child's needs as she did at the time of placement, despite numerous attempts by the Agency to connect her with services designed to enable and empower her to do so. Meanwhile, the Child has had her basic needs met by her step-grandfather and his significant other, and has flourished while in their care. It is clear to this Court that termination of Mother's parental rights would best serve the needs and welfare of the Child.

As the Court has found that statutory grounds for termination have been met under all four subsections of 23 Pa. C.S. §2511(a) contained in the Petition to Involuntarily Terminate Parental Rights, the Court must now consider the following:

23 Pa.C.S. § 2511(b) OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.—The Court in terminating the rights of a parent shall give primary consideration to the developmental, physical and emotional needs and welfare of the child.

The rights of a parent shall not be terminated solely on the basis of environmental factors such as inadequate housing, furnishings, income, clothing and medical care if found to be beyond the control of the parent. With respect to any petition filed pursuant to subsection (a)(1), (6) or (8), the court shall not consider any efforts by the parent to remedy the conditions described therein which are first initiated subsequent to the giving of notice of the filing of the petition.

The Court must take into account whether a bond exists between the child and parent, and whether termination would destroy an existing, necessary and beneficial relationship. **In the Interest of C.S.**, *supra*, at 1202. When conducting a bonding analysis, the Court is not required to use expert testimony. **In re: K.K.R.-S.**, 958 A.2d 529, 533 (Pa. Super. 2008) (citing **In re: I.A.C.**, 897 A.2d 1200, 1208-1209 (Pa. Super. 2006)). In this case, the Agency requested Mother attend a bonding assessment with Dr. Denise Feger at Crossroads Counseling. The initial appointment, scheduled for September 2, 2021, was canceled by Dr. Feger, and rescheduled to September 23, 2021. The Agency transported the Child to the office on that date but Mother did not appear. Dr. Feger's office and the Agency placed the responsibility on Mother to reschedule the assessment but Mother never reached out to reschedule and therefore the bonding assessment did not occur.

The Court has no doubt that Mother loves the Child. However, a parent's own feelings of love and affection for a child do not prevent termination of parental rights. **In re: L.M.**, 923 A.2d 505, 512 (Pa. Super. 2007).

Before granting a petition to terminate parental rights, it is imperative that a trial court carefully consider the *intangible* dimension of the needs and welfare of a child--the love, comfort, security and closeness--entailed in a parent-child relationship, as well as the tangible dimension. Continuity of relationships is also important to a child, for whom severance of close parental ties is usually extremely painful. The trial court, in considering what situation would best serve the children's needs and welfare, must

examine the status of the natural parental bond to consider whether terminating the natural parents' rights would destroy something in existence that is necessary and beneficial.

In the Interest of C.S., supra., at 1202 (citations omitted).

The Child calls Mother "Mom," and although there naturally is some bond between Mother and the Child, she spends only one hour every other week with Mother – when Mother decides to attend visits, and their time together is always supervised. Heather Wood, Specialized Services Supervisor at the Agency, testified that Mother often struggles with emotional management and talking about inappropriate subjects with the Child at the visits she attends. Mother tends to push her feelings on the Child, is overly affectionate with her, and does not understand or appreciate when that makes the Child feel uncomfortable. What bond remains between Mother and the Child is not necessarily healthy or beneficial to the Child.

Additionally, the existence of some bond with Mother does not necessarily defeat termination of her parental rights. **In re K.Z.S.**, 946 A.2d, 753, 764 (Pa.Super. 2008). The question becomes whether the bond between the Child and Mother is the *one worth saving* or whether it could be sacrificed without irreparable harm to the Child. **Id.** (emphasis added). The Child is currently in a loving and stable home, with her step-grandfather and his significant other. She currently attends pre-kindergarten will start Kindergarten in the fall of 2022. She is enrolled in dance classes and is a healthy and well-rounded 5 year old. BC and DW have provided the Child with stable housing, proper nutrition, routine medical care, love, support, and guidance. This type of consistency and follow-through that has allowed the Child to thrive while in their care is exactly what Mother lacks the ability to achieve.

Mother has been offered numerous services by the Agency since her initial involvement in October of 2020. These services were designed to assist Mother with obtaining stable housing, basic parenting, budgeting, connecting with community resources, and follow-through. Mother failed to take advantage of these services and made absolutely no progress towards alleviating the conditions which necessitated the Child's removal from her care. The Child has been in this placement for approximately 18 months, and is in a loving and stable home where all her needs are met.

BC and DW have provided everything the Child needs and this has naturally established a bond and attachment between the Child and the individuals whom she identifies as her primary caretakers. The Child's permanency cannot and should not be delayed until Mother gains the skills necessary to independently and consistently provide appropriate care for the Child. The Child is clearly bonded BC and DW, who have provided for her physical and emotional needs for the past 18 months, and who are willing to offer her permanency. The Court is satisfied that termination of Mother's parental rights would not cause irreparable harm to the Child. This Court further finds that permanency in the form of adoption by those who have met her needs since February 10, 2021, is in the best interest of the Child.

Conclusions of Law

1. The Court finds that the Agency has established by clear and convincing evidence that DB, by conduct continuing for a period of at least six months immediately preceding the filing of the petition has failed to perform parental duties pursuant to 23 Pa.C.S. §2511(a)(1).

2. The Court finds that the Agency has established by clear and convincing evidence that DB, has exhibited repeated and continued incapacity, abuse, neglect or refusal which has caused the Child to be without essential parental care, control or subsistence necessary for his physical or mental well-being and the conditions and causes of the incapacity, abuse, neglect or refusal cannot or will not be remedied by her pursuant to 23 Pa.C.S. §2511(a)(2).

3. The Court finds that the Agency has established by clear and convincing evidence that the child has been removed from DB's care for a period of at least six months, that the conditions which led to the removal or placement of the child continue to exist, that the conditions which led to the removal or placement of the child are not likely to be remedied within a reasonable period of time, and that termination of Mother's parental rights would best serve the needs and welfare of the child pursuant to 23 Pa.C.S. §2511(a)(5).

4. The Court finds that the Agency has established by clear and convincing evidence that the child has been removed from DB's care for a period of twelve months or more, that the conditions which led to the removal or placement of the child continue to exist, and that termination of Mother's parental rights would best serve the needs and welfare of the child pursuant to 23 Pa.C.S. §2511(a)(8).

5. The Court finds that the Agency has established by clear and convincing evidence that the developmental, physical and emotional needs and welfare of the Child

will be best served by the termination of Mother's parental rights pursuant to 23 Pa.C.S. §2511(b).

Accordingly, the Court will enter the attached Decree.

By the Court,

Ryan M. Tira, Judge

RMT/jel

c. John Pietrovito, Esquire
Jessica Feese, Esquire
Angela Lovecchio, Esquire
Children & Youth
CASA
Gary Weber, Esquire
Jennifer E. Linn, Esquire

**IN THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS OF LYCOMING COUNTY,
PENNSYLVANIA
ORPHANS' COURT DIVISION**

IN RE: : **NO. 2022-6783**
:
HB, :
: **Minor child** :

DECREE

AND NOW, this 11th day of **May, 2022**, after a hearing on the Petition for Involuntary Termination of the Parental Rights of DB, held on May 3, 2022, it is hereby ORDERED and DECREED:

- (1) That the parental rights of DB be, and hereby are, terminated as to the child above-named;
- (2) That the welfare of the child will be promoted by adoption; that all requirements of the Adoption Act have been met; that the child may be the subject of adoption proceedings without any further notice to the natural mother.

NOTICE TO NATURAL PARENT

PENNSYLVANIA ADOPTION MEDICAL HISTORY REGISTRY

This is to inform you about an adoption law provision relating to medical history information. As the birth parent of a Pennsylvania born child who is being, or was ever adopted in the past, you have the opportunity to voluntarily place on file medical history information. The information which you choose to provide could be important to this child's present and future medical care needs.

The law makes it possible for you to file current medical information, but it also allows you to update the information as new medically related information becomes available. Requests to release the information will be honored if the request is submitted by a birth child 18 years of age or older. The law also permits that the court honor requests for information submitted by the adoptive parents or legal guardians of adoptees who are not yet 18 years of age. All information will be maintained and distributed in a manner that fully protects your right to privacy.

You may obtain the appropriate form for you to file medical history information by contacting the Adoption Medical History Registry. Registry staff are available to answer your questions. Please contact them at:

Department of Human Services
Pennsylvania Adoption Information Registry
P.O. Box 4379
Harrisburg, PA 17105-17111
Telephone: 1-800-227-0225

Medical history information forms may also be obtained locally by contacting one of the following agencies:

1. County Children & Youth Social Service Agency
2. Any private licensed adoption agency
3. Register & Recorder's Office
4. Online at www.adoptpakids.org/Forms.aspx

By the Court,

Ryan M. Tira, Judge

RMT/jel

cc. John Pietrovito, Esquire
Jessica Feese, Esquire
Angela Lovecchio, Esquire
Children & Youth
CASA
Gary Weber, Esquire
Jennifer E. Linn, Esquire