

IN RE ACE R.

Submitted on Briefs November 29, 2016

Decided December 6, 2016

Panel: SAUFLEY, C.J., and ALEXANDER, MEAD, JABAR, HJELM, and HUMPHREY, JJ.

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

The mother of Ace R. appeals¹ from a judgment of the District Court (Lewiston, *Dow, J.*) terminating her parental rights with respect to her minor child. On appeal, the mother argues that the court erred in finding that she is “unwilling or unable to protect the child from jeopardy and these circumstances are unlikely to change within a time which is reasonably calculated to meet the child’s needs,” and that she “has failed to make a good faith effort to rehabilitate and reunify with the child.” See 22 M.R.S. § 4055(1)(B)(2)(b)(i), (v) (2015). Further, she argues that the court abused its discretion in determining that termination of her parental rights was in the child’s best interest.

There is competent evidence on the record to support the court’s finding of the statutory bases for termination by clear and convincing evidence. See *In re Marcus S.*, 2007 ME 24, ¶ 6, 916 A.2d 225. Further, the court did not abuse its discretion in determining that termination of the mother’s parental rights is

¹ The mother’s attorney has submitted a brief in which she represents that, after reviewing the case file, transcript, and appendix, “she believes in good faith . . . there are no arguable issues of merit on appeal in this case.” See *In re M.C.*, 2014 ME 128, ¶ 7, 104 A.3d 139. Pursuant to the procedures set forth in *In re M.C.*, this Court granted the mother an enlargement of time to file a supplemental brief, but she did not file one.

in the child's best interest. *See* 22 M.R.S. § 4055(1)(B)(2)(a); *In re R.M.*, 2015 ME 38, ¶ 7, 114 A.3d 212. Therefore, we affirm.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

On the briefs:

Erika S. Bristol, Esq., Auburn, for appellant mother

The Department of Health and Human Services did not file a brief