

RECORD IMPOUNDED

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION WITHOUT THE
APPROVAL OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION**

This opinion shall not "constitute precedent or be binding upon any court." Although it is posted on the internet, this opinion is binding only on the parties in the case and its use in other cases is limited. R. 1:36-3.

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
APPELLATE DIVISION
DOCKET NO. A-2209-19T1

NEW JERSEY DIVISION
OF CHILD PROTECTION
AND PERMANCY,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

J.G.K.,

Defendant-Appellant,

and

A.W.S.,

Defendant.

IN THE MATTER OF THE
GUARDIANSHIP OF I.J.K.
and J.M.J.,

Minors-Respondents.

Submitted October 27, 2020 – Decided November 6, 2020

Before Judges Fisher and Moynihan.

On appeal from the Superior Court of New Jersey, Chancery Division, Family Part, Essex County, Docket No. FG-07-0114-19.

Joseph E. Krakora, Public Defender, attorney for appellant (Robyn A. Veasey, Deputy Public Defender, of counsel; Richard Sparaco, Designated Counsel, on the briefs).

Gurbir S. Grewal, Attorney General, attorney for respondent (Sookie Bae, Assistant Attorney General, of counsel; Amy L. Bernstein, Deputy Attorney General, on the brief).

Joseph E. Krakora, Public Defender, Law Guardian, attorney for minors (Meredith Alexis Pollock, Deputy Public Defender, of counsel; Noel C. Devlin, Assistant Deputy Public Defender, of counsel and on the brief).

PER CURIAM


Defendant J.G.K.'s parental rights to two daughters, one born in October 2017 and the other in September 2018, were terminated after a three-day trial. The judge concluded, among many other things, that defendant suffers from mental health issues, crediting testimony that "paint[ed] a picture of [defendant's] paranoia, confusion and irrational thinking that affects and impacts [her] decision making and everyday function." The judge found defendant unable or unwilling to address these and other circumstances – finding they were

"get[ting] worse" – and that these circumstances precluded defendant's ability to care for and parent these two children.

In appealing, defendant argues there was insufficient evidence in the record to support the judge's findings. In applying the familiar deferential standard of appellate review, N.J. Div. of Youth & Family Servs. v. F.M., 211 N.J. 420, 448-49 (2012), we reject defendant's arguments because we are satisfied from our review of the record that the judge's findings on all four statutory prongs, N.J.S.A. 30:4C-15.1(a), were well-supported by clear and convincing evidence. We affirm substantially for the reasons set forth by Judge Linda L. Cavanaugh in her comprehensive and well-reasoned forty-six-page written opinion.

Affirmed.

I hereby certify that the foregoing
is a true copy of the original on
file in my office.


CLERK OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION