

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

IN RE: : **NO. 2022-6798**
:
IB, :
:
Minor child :

OPINION IN SUPPORT OF THE ORDER DOCKETED SEPTEMBER 16, 2022

AND NOW, this 19th day of **September, 2022**, before the Court is Lycoming County Children & Youth Services' ("Agency") Petition for Involuntary Termination of Parental Rights filed on April 13, 2022, with regard to IB ("Child"). A hearing on the Petition for Involuntary Termination of Parental Rights was held on September 15, 2022. JJ ("Father") failed to appear but was represented by Jessica Feese, Esquire. AB ("Mother") participated by telephone and was represented by Trisha Hoover Jasper, Esquire. John Pietrovito, Esquire, Solicitor for the Agency, and Angela Lovecchio, Esquire, counsel for the Child, were also present at the hearing.

On August 25, 2022, Mother signed a Consent to Adopt. At the time of the hearing on the Petition for Involuntary Termination of Parental Rights, Mother stipulated to all of the allegations in the Petition and to the admission of Exhibits 1-13, and 34. Additionally, Mother agreed that, had the Agency presented it's full case against Mother with respect to the termination of her parental rights, they would have met their burden by clear and convincing evidence with respect to establishing grounds for termination, and that they would have met the requirements under 23 Pa.C.S. §2511(b) that termination of her parental rights would best serve the needs and welfare of the Child.

Following this recital on the record, Attorney Jasper was excused from the proceedings. This Opinion and Order will focus solely on the termination of Father's parental rights.

Findings of Facts

IB was born on July 15, 2014. He is the child of JJ, date of birth [redacted], and AB, date of birth [redacted]. Mother and Father were not married at the time of the Child's birth.

The Child was placed in the emergency custody of the Agency on January 13, 2021, following an incident where Father was not present to get the Child off the bus after school. Both Agency caseworkers and school staff repeatedly attempted to contact Father and when their efforts were unsuccessful, the Agency requested, and was granted, emergency custody of the Child. Father contacted the Agency at approximately 2:00 a.m. on January 14, 2021, to inquire about several missed calls and messages. He did not ask about the location of his son during this conversation. A Shelter Care Hearing was held on January 15, 2021, at which time the Court found that allowing the Child to remain in the home would be contrary to his welfare. Legal and physical custody of the Child was to remain with the Agency and the Child was to remain in foster care.

A Dependency Hearing was held on January 22, 2021, at which time the Court found that the Child was without proper care or control, education as required by law, or other care or control necessary for his physical, mental, or emotional health, or morals. The Court ordered that legal and physical custody remain with the Agency and that the Child remain in foster care. The Court noted that the Child had been absent from school on thirty-six (36) days, with twenty-one (21) of those days being unexcused, and that

Father had previously been referred for Outreach Services by Bradford County CYS, but those were discontinued due to Father's noncompliance.

A permanency review hearing was held on May 14, 2021. Father did not attend. The Court noted that Father had only minimal compliance with the permanency plan, in that he attended twelve (12) out of twenty-six (26) visits during the review period. He attended an intake at Crossroads but did not attend any sessions and was discharged on April 6, 2021, due to non-attendance. Father was not compliant with Outreach services and they were subsequently closed. Father relocated to Bradford County. Father was found to have made no progress towards alleviating the circumstances which necessitated the original placement. Following the hearing, the Court reaffirmed dependency and the Child remained in the legal and physical custody of the Agency with continued placement in his foster care home.

A permanency review hearing was held on August 16, 2021. Father did not attend. The Court found that Father had no compliance with the permanency plan, in that he attended only eight (8) out of nineteen (19) visits during the review period. The Agency received a report on June 7, 2021, that Father had overdosed and was receiving inpatient services at Family Recovery Solutions, but Father did not provide any documentation to support this. Father did not participate in any other drug or alcohol treatment during this review period, nor did he participate in any parenting programs. The Court further found that Father had made no progress towards alleviating the circumstances which necessitated the original placement and noted that Father needed to take steps to seek help for himself before he could be considered a resource for the Child. Following the hearing, the Court reaffirmed dependency and the

Child remained in the legal and physical custody of the Agency with continued placement in his foster care home.

A permanency review hearing was held on November 29, 2021. Father attended by telephone. The Court found that Father had no compliance with the permanency plan, in that he attended no visits during the review period, participated in no drug or alcohol programs during the review period, and had not participated in any programs for parenting during the review period. Father's communication with the Agency was very sporadic. For these reasons, the Court also found that Father had made no progress towards alleviating the circumstances which necessitated the original placement. The Agency requested that Father's visits be reduced to the statutory minimum of one time every other week for one hour. The Court granted this request, with the caveat that if Father attended regularly his visits may be increased. Following the hearing, the Court reaffirmed dependency and the Child remained in the legal and physical custody of the Agency with continued placement in his foster care home.

A permanency review hearing was held on March 9, 2022. Father attended in person. During this review period, the Child's placement was modified to the [redacted] resource home, where he has remained since that time. Also during this review period the Agency filed its Petition for Involuntary Termination of Parental Rights. The Petition for Involuntary Termination alleged termination was warranted under 23 Pa.C.S. §2511(a)(1), (2), (5), and (8). The Court found that Father had minimal compliance with the permanency plan. He attended four (4) out of eight (8) visits and had four (4) no-shows. He was receiving no drug or alcohol services, and had not participated in any services for parenting. Father was not involved with Outreach services. For these reasons, the Court found that Father had made no progress towards alleviating the

circumstances which necessitated the original placement. Following the hearing, the Court reaffirmed dependency and the Child remained in the legal and physical custody of the Agency with continued placement in his foster care home. The Court directed the Agency to make a referral to Outreach services to Father, and to offer to provide those services at the Agency on the same day as Father's scheduled visits with the Child.

A permanency review hearing was held on June 24, 2022. Father attended in person. The Court found that Father had minimal compliance with the permanency plan, in that he attended six (6) out of seven (7) visits. However, he was still not receiving any drug or alcohol counseling and he only attended two Outreach appointments. He did not participate in any of the Child's medication checks, which occurred virtually. Father requested that his visits be increased to one time per week, which the Court granted as he had demonstrated good attendance during this review period and the visits were going well. The Court found that Father had made minimal progress towards alleviating the circumstances which necessitated the original placement, as he reported having a trailer to live in but that he had quit his job and his sole source of income was SSD. Following the hearing, the Court reaffirmed dependency and the Child remained in the legal and physical custody of the Agency with continued placement in his foster care home.

The hearing on the Petition for Involuntary Termination of Parental Rights was held on September 15, 2022, and Father, though properly served with notice of the time, date, and location, failed to appear and participate in the hearing. As noted above, Mother signed a Consent to Adopt on August 25, 2022, and participated in the hearing by telephone.

Discussion

In cases of termination of parental rights, the burden of proof is on the party seeking termination to establish by clear and convincing evidence the existence of grounds for doing so. **In re Adoption of A.C.H.**, 803 A.2d 224, 228 (Pa. Super.2002). The standard of clear and convincing evidence means testimony that is “so clear, direct, weighty, and convincing as to enable the trier of fact to come to a clear conviction, without hesitation, of the truth of the precise facts in issue.” **In re J.D.W.M.**, 810 A.2d 688, 690 (Pa.Super.2002). 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 provide 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 Father'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 orphans' court must then consider the parent's explanation for his or her abandonment of the child, in addition to any post-abandonment contact. **In re Adoption of C.J.A.**, 204 A.3d 496, 503 (Pa. Super. 2019).

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). Heather Wood, Specialized Services Supervisor for the Agency, testified that Father has been on call-in status since March 3, 2021, meaning he must call the Agency between 8:00 – 8:30 a.m. on the day of his scheduled visit to indicate that he will be attending, and if he does not, the Child will not be transported to the visit. On March 24, 2021, Father was placed on check-in status, meaning that in addition to calling in the morning of the visit, Father must arrive one hour before the scheduled visit or the Child would not be transported to the visit. These extra conditions were put in place due to Father's excessive no-shows, which would disappoint the Child and cause unnecessary

disruptions to his schedule. At one point, the Agency requested that Father's visits be reduced to the statutory minimum due to his poor attendance. With the exception of one review period, Father never attended more than 44% of his visits during a review period.

Given the fact that Father had a very inconsistent visitation attendance, and he failed to maintain frequent and regular contact with the Agency, and failed to take advantage of all the resources offered to him to help him maintain a bond with the Child, this Court is satisfied that he has demonstrated a settled purpose of relinquishing parental claim to the Child. Additionally, grounds for termination under 23 Pa.C.S. 2511(a)(1) may also 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 placed in foster care due to concerns about parenting, truancy and inadequate supervision. For the duration of his time in foster care, the Child's greatest needs have been food, shelter, clothing, education, medical care, and comfort. Thus, in order to satisfy his obligation to perform parental duties, Father would have to feed the Child when he was hungry, provide stable housing, make and attend medical appointments, provide financial support for the Child, and comfort him when he was sick or scared. Father's poor attendance record has precluded him from performing these duties with consistency and the Child has had to rely on his foster family to provide for all of his physical and emotional needs.

Although Father appeared to be very engaged in the visits, his attendance was very inconsistent. Additionally, Heather Wood testified that he spent only 36.3 total hours with the Child since his placement. This is insufficient to satisfy Father's obligation to perform parental duties and to establish and maintain a place of importance in the Child's life. 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 Father has both evidenced a settled purpose to relinquish parental claim to the Child *and* failed to perform his parental duties for at least six months prior to the filing of the termination petition.

To satisfy the requirements of Section 2511(a)(2), the Agency must demonstrate that Father, 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).

For much of the dependency case, Father has struggled with stable housing, parenting, and communication with the Agency, and has not been able to make any progress towards reunification with the Child. “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). David Ryder and Barbie Barnes, Outreach Services caseworkers, both testified regarding the goals established for Father in the service plan and the level of progress Father made towards achieving those goals. Mr. Ryder became

involved with Father pursuant to a referral from Bradford County prior to the Agency filing a Petition for Dependency. He testified that it was difficult, if not impossible, to coordinate meetings with Father and get him to follow through. He testified that Father had multiple different phone numbers over the course of their relationship and he was always trying to catch up with him. Mr. Ryder spent most of his time while involved with this case addressing issues with getting the Child to school. He testified that they were never able to work on the identified goals of parenting, budgeting, organization, and follow through and that Father made no progress. As a result of Father's lack of participation, Mr. Ryder closed services on April 13, 2021.

Ms. Barnes received a referral for Outreach Services for Father on March 31, 2022, after the Child was adjudicated dependent. Although Father maintained the same phone number during their relationship, Ms. Barnes testified to a similar experience as Mr. Ryder, in that Father had very little communication with her. As a result, Ms. Barnes and Father only met 3 times and therefore Father made no progress on the identified goals of parenting and housing. On August 10, 2022, Father sent Ms. Barnes a lengthy text message stating he wanted to close services. Ms. Barnes mailed him a letter on August 11, 2022, indicating that services were strongly recommended, still available, and available to reopen at any time. Father did not respond so Outreach Services were closed on August 25, 2022.

Father's lack of follow-through has resulted in his inability to achieve stable housing or learn to properly parent the Child and meet basic needs. Given Father's failure to work with the Agency or to make any progress on goals to

enable him to provide proper parental care and control necessary for the Child's physical and mental well-being this Court finds that he will be unable to remedy his incapacities which have prevented him from being reunified with the Child. This Court is unwilling to further delay the Child's permanency while waiting for Father to become 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 Father's repeated and continued incapacity has caused the Child to be without essential parental control or subsistence necessary for his 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 Father's parental rights exist under both Sections 2511(a)(5) and (8). The Child entered Agency custody on January 13, 2021, and was in Agency custody for over one year 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, Father was found to have minimal to no compliance with the permanency plan and made no progress towards alleviating the conditions which necessitated the Child's placement. As both of Father's previous Outreach Services caseworkers testified at the hearing, Father's lack of follow-through inhibited his ability to meet his Outreach Services goals. Similarly, Ryan Snyder, Ongoing Services Unit Supervisor and current caseworker for this matter, testified that the Agency's concerns included inappropriate supervision, substance abuse concerns, and truancy concerns. Father has struggled to maintain safe, stable housing for himself and the Child, is not consistently employed or financially stable, has no-showed two scheduled evaluations at Crossroads Counseling and is receiving no outpatient services for substance abuse, and has not attended visits frequently enough to establish a bond with the Child. In short, Father has not been able to provide for the Child's

basic needs. The Child has had his basic needs met by his resource parent, who have also provided him with proper medical care, love, and support. It is clear to this Court that termination of Father'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)). "Above all else . . . adequate consideration must be given to the needs and welfare of the child." **In re: J.D.W.M.**, 810 A.2d 688, 690 (Pa. Super. 2002).

It is noted that the Agency scheduled a bonding assessment to take place on September 6, 2022, with Dr. Denise Feger after Father's scheduled visit with the Child; however, Father did not attend that visit and the formal assessment could not be completed. It is clear to this Court that when Father was visiting with the Child, he was

very invested in the relationship with 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).

In the present case, the Court feels strongly that any bond between the Child and Father has deteriorated due to Father's inconsistency in attending visits. Father has been offered numerous services by the Agency. These services were designed to enable Father to gain stability, address his substance abuse issues, and learn basic parenting skills that he could put into practice during regularly scheduled visits. Unfortunately, Father participation in the services was minimal and his attendance at visits was inconsistent.

There was an abundance of testimony that the Child is very bonded with the foster mother, [redacted], with whom he has resided for six months. The Child is currently in a loving and stable home. He is in good health and is attending Crossroads Counseling and participates in Friendship House at school. The Child attends school every day. [redacted] takes the Child to all of his medical appointments and manages his medication. She has provided everything the Child needs and this has naturally fostered a bond and attachment between the Child and the individual caring for him.

[redacted] is ready, willing, and able to adopt the Child. The Child's permanency cannot and should not be delayed until Father decides to make tangible steps towards establishing a bond and being a resource for the Child. The Child is clearly bonded with the resource parent, who has provided for his physical and emotional needs since he was placed in her care, and who is willing to offer him permanency. The Court is satisfied that termination of Father's parental rights would not destroy an existing bond or cause any trauma to the Child and that permanency in the form of adoption by his current foster parent 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 JJ, by conduct continuing for a period of at least six months immediately preceding the filing of the petition has evidenced a settled purpose to relinquish parental claim to the Child and 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 JJ, 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 him 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 JJ'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 Father'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 JJ'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 Father'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 no bond exists between JJ and the Child and that the developmental, physical and emotional needs and welfare of the Child will be best served by the termination of his parental rights pursuant to 23 Pa.C.S. §2511(b).

By the Court,

Ryan M. Tira, Judge

RMT/jel

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