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## MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

The mother of S.B. appeals from a judgment of the District Court (Portland, Powers, J.) terminating her parental rights pursuant to 22 M.R.S. § 4055(1)(A), (B)(2) (2014). The record supports the trial court's finding that, notwithstanding the mother's love for her child and her participation in mental health and supported parenting services, she has not been successful in her reunification efforts and is unable to care for the child.

Contrary to the mother's contentions, competent evidence in the record supports the court's determination, by clear and convincing evidence, of at least one ground of parental unfitness. See 22 M.R.S. § 4055(1)(B)(2)(b)(i)-(ii) (2014); In re Elizabeth D., 2006 ME 2, ब 2, 888 A.2d 281. To the extent the court erred in allowing S.B.'s half-sister, a nonparty, to remain in the courtroom during the termination hearing, ${ }^{1}$ the error was harmless and did not result in prejudice. See 22 M.R.S. § 4005-D(2)-(3) (2014); M.R. Civ. P. 61.

[^0]The entry is:

## Judgment affirmed.
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[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ We clarify now that a nonparty must request status as an interested party, intervenor, or participant pursuant to 22 M.R.S. § $4005-\mathrm{D}(2)$, (3), or (5) (2014), and the court must designate a nonparty's status as such, before allowing the nonparty to remain in the courtroom during a closed child protective proceeding.

