

IN RE CHILD OF ARTHUR C.

Submitted on Briefs February 22, 2023

Decided March 2, 2023

Panel: MEAD, JABAR, HORTON, CONNORS, and LAWRENCE, JJ.

MEMORANDUM OF DECISION

Arthur C. appeals from a judgment of the District Court (Lewiston, *S. Driscoll, J.*) terminating his parental rights to his child. Contrary to the father's contentions, the trial court did not err or abuse its discretion in determining that the father is unable to protect his child from jeopardy or take responsibility for the child within a time reasonably calculated to meet the child's needs and that termination of the father's parental rights is in the child's best interest. *See* 22 M.R.S. § 4055(1)(B)(2)(a), (b)(i)-(ii) (2022).

None of the father's remaining contentions was raised during the trial court proceedings, and, consequently, those issues are waived. *See In re Anthony R.*, 2010 ME 4, ¶ 8, 987 A.2d 532 (“[W]e will not reach an issue, even a constitutional challenge to an action, if the issue is presented for the first time on appeal.”). To the extent that any of the father's arguments are cognizable on appeal, we review the record for obvious error, *see In re Child of Lacy H.*, 2019 ME 110, ¶ 9, 212 A.3d 320, and find none.¹

¹ The father also contends that the transcript is inadequate for appellate review. We disagree but note that, if the transcript were deficient, then it would have been the father's burden to provide us with an adequate record for review. *See* M.R. App. P. 5(d)-(f); *Springer v. Springer*, 2009 ME 118, ¶¶ 2-8, 984 A.2d 828.

The entry is:

Judgment affirmed.

Brittany Sawyer, Esq., Holmes Legal Group, LLC, Wells, for appellant Arthur C.

Aaron M. Frey, Attorney General, and Hunter C. Umphrey, Asst. Atty. Gen., Office of the Attorney General, Bangor, for appellee Department of Health and Human Services

Lewiston District Court docket number PC-2019-75
FOR CLERK REFERENCE ONLY