

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

In re L.R. et al., Persons Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY DEPARTMENT
OF PUBLIC SOCIAL SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

L.R. et al.,

Defendants and Appellants.

E060829

(Super.Ct.No. RIJ105979)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of Riverside County. John M. Monterosso,
Judge. Affirmed.

Roni Keller, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant, L.D.

Diana W. Prince, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant, L.R.

Sharon S. Rollo, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Sibling, Q. G..

Gregory P. Priamos, County Counsel, and Anna M. Marchand and Julie Koons Jarvi, Deputy County Counsel, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

L.R. (Father) and L.D. (Mother) appeal after the termination of their parental rights to L1, L2 and L3 at a Welfare and Institutions Code section 366.26¹ hearing. Mother and Father each contend that the juvenile court erred by terminating parental rights and selecting adoption as the permanent plan. Q., a half-sister of L1, L2 and L3, also appeals and joins in Mother's argument.

Father committed sexual acts against Q., L1, L2 and L3, and Mother did nothing to stop him or protect her children. As a result, L1, L2 and L3 were severely traumatized and acted out. Based on their behaviors, they were placed in numerous foster homes throughout the dependency proceedings. A prospective adoptive family was found and L1, L2 and L3 were finally placed in a suitable and stable home. We affirm the juvenile court's order.

¹ All further statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code unless otherwise indicated.

PROCEDURAL AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND²A. *Detention*

On March 21, 2012, 10-year-old Q., 5-year-old L1, 4-year-old L2, and 14-month-old L3 were detained by the Riverside County Department of Public Social Services (the Department). On March 16, 2012, Q. was brought to the San Bernardino Children's Assessment Center for a child abuse and neglect examination. It was discovered that Q. had sustained injuries to her vagina and had severe anal lacerations. The anal laceration was reported to have occurred on March 3, 2012, but was never treated. It was determined that Q. may need surgery after the infection healed. On March 20, 2012, the results of a urinalysis test revealed that Q. suffered from gonorrhea. An investigation into the perpetrator of the sexual abuse against Q. was ongoing.

The children were detained from Mother. Q. had a different father, E.M. Father was the alleged father of L1, L2 and L3. All four children were placed in a foster home together pending the investigation.

It was reported to the Department that on March 3, 2012, Q. was found locked in a bedroom with the family's pit bull. The door had to be knocked down. Once inside, Q.

² Mother and Father only contest the adoptability finding by the juvenile court as to L1, L2 and L3. As such, we need not elaborate on the facts involving efforts made by Mother and Father to reunify or the details of their visitation with the children. In addition, we need not address matters relating to Q. that did not involve L1, L2 and L3.

was reported to have blood running down her leg from her rectum. It was reported that Mother washed her up and called E.M. to come get Q.

On March 10, 2012, Mother brought Q. to E.M.'s home located in San Bernardino. E.M. looked at her injuries, which he acknowledged were very bad, but he did not immediately take her to the hospital because other family members were concerned due to the family's previous involvement with the Department. Q. would not tell E.M. what had happened but she was not acting like herself. E.M. was told by Mother that Q. had been attacked by the pit bull. It was reported to him that the dog got on top of her and penetrated her rectum.

Q. told the social worker that she had been at home with her cousins and sisters. She claimed she spilled something on her pants and went into her bedroom to change. She said the pit bull was in the room. It jumped on top of her and "hurt her." Her cousin had to pull the dog off of her. Q. denied she had been abused by any parent or adult.

It was reported by the doctor that examined Q., that there had never been reports of a dog doing this to a child. Further, a child could not contract gonorrhea from a dog. The only way that she reasonably contracted gonorrhea was through sexual activity with another person.

A visit to Mother's home was conducted. She insisted only she and her four children lived in the two-bedroom apartment. Mother reiterated that Q.'s injuries were caused by the dog. Mother was married to Father but she insisted that they had separated the prior December. Mother explained that Father was a registered sex offender and

could not live with them. She admitted that at one point he cut off his ankle monitor and she kicked him out.

Mother reported that she had previously found Q. trying to “hump” L1 and L2. Mother reported she had been sexually abused between the ages of twelve and sixteen by family members and friends.

On March 21, 2012, forensic interviews of the children were conducted. Q. continued to claim that her injuries were caused by the pit bull. Q. insisted she told Mother what had happened several days later and that Mother had not cleaned her injuries. It was determined by law enforcement that Q. should not be pushed to identify the perpetrator who gave her gonorrhea and that the children should be detained. A second exam of Q. showed she still had a deep anal laceration and it was infected. Q. also had a laceration on her vagina.

Mother admitted that Father had given her gonorrhea several years ago. Q. was treated for her gonorrhea. The children were detained on March 21, 2012. E.M. admitted to recently using marijuana and he was out of work. Father had been convicted in 2003 with having sex with a minor. He also had previous arrests for indecent exposure; he exposed and fondled himself in front of an elementary school. Mother, E.M. and Father all had prior involvement with the Department for drug use and neglect of Q.

On March 23, 2012, an original section 300 petition was filed by the Department.³ At a detention hearing held on March 26, 2012, the juvenile court found a prima facie case and ordered all four children detained.

B. *Jurisdictional/Dispositional Report and Hearing*

In a jurisdictional/dispositional report filed on April 12, 2012, the Department recommended that both Father and Mother be denied reunification services pursuant to section 361.5, subdivisions (a), (b)(1), (b)(2), and (b)(6). It was also recommended that E.M. receive services for Q.

Q. had made further statements during the reporting period that Father had been living with them on March 3, 2012, and had been home that day. She also stated that defendant had previously hit her and given her bruises for no reason and Mother had not protected her. L1 had reported that both Mother and Father hit her with a belt on her buttocks. She reported no sexual abuse. L2 had reported no sexual abuse, but had stopped talking and hid in a corner when questioned about any abuse. A minor witness who was in the home at the time of the incident on March 3, 2012, insisted that only the dog and Q. were in the room when she found Q. bloody. The witness also reported that the Mother found out about the injuries that same day and never took her for medical care.

³ The petition was later amended when more allegations of sexual abuse were discovered, as will be set forth in further detail, *post*.

When Q. was confronted with the fact that she could have only gotten gonorrhea from a person, she avoided eye contact and changed the subject. Q. was not going to need surgery.

The foster family had reported some problems with the children's adjustment to the home. Q. had been found with her younger siblings watching pornography, which she ordered on the television. Q. had been caught picking locks at the home and having guests in the home despite being told no one could come in the house. Q. had tried to meet boys at the park. She was very demanding and yelled at the foster parents. Q. had hit her younger siblings trying to discipline them herself.

In an addendum report dated May 17, 2012, Q. had been separated from L1, L2 and L3. L1, L2 and L3 had been moved to a new foster home and Q. was on her own in another home. Q. had been found in a locked room with her two younger siblings and had undressed them.

E.M. was living in a one-bedroom apartment with his mother. Father had turned himself in on April 24, 2012. He denied any sexual contact with the four children. He admitted living in the home with Q. on March 3, 2012, which violated his Penal Code section 290 registration.

Another addendum report was filed on July 19, 2012. Q. was once again being moved from her foster home. Q. was exhibiting anger and aggression. Q. had told the foster mother she wanted to kill her family.

Mother had been evaluated by two psychologists. She was reported to be suffering from a personality disorder with narcissistic components which had no known

treatment. She also was found to have post traumatic stress disorder due to sexual abuse as a child. She reported also being sexually molested when she was between nine and ten years old by a cousin. She was raped thereafter several times by family friends.

Mother was advised that L1 and L2 were exhibiting hypersexualized behaviors. They had been seen by the foster parent humping one another, masturbating themselves and kissing each other with open mouths and tongues. Mother had no reaction and blamed the actions on them being in the foster home. L1 and L2 were both wetting their beds. Mother continued to deny any contact with Father. However, Father was released from custody on July 8, 2012, and was expected to register his address as living with Mother. Father admitted he was the father of L3, L2 and L1.

Another addendum report was filed on August 21, 2012. Q. had been approved to enter the Multidimensional Foster Treatment Team and would be placed in a group home by September 24, 2012. The other three children remained together.

An addendum report was filed on September 6, 2012. On September 4, 2012, the Department was informed by L1 that she had been sexually assaulted by Father. She provided graphic details of the molestation. L1 also reported she had witnessed Father sexually assault Q. and L2. L1 reported that Mother was present when Father sexually assaulted the children and did not intervene to help them. On September 5, 2012, L2 was interviewed. She also provided graphic details of sexual assaults committed by Father. She said that he also assaulted Q., L1 and L3. Due to the pending criminal investigation of Father, the Department was unable to provide the details of the molestations. The juvenile court terminated all contact between Father, Mother and the children.

A fourth amended section 300 petition was filed on September 21, 2012 for all four children. It was alleged under section 300, subdivision (b), a failure to protect, as follows: (1) while under the care of Mother, Q. sustained severe rectal and vaginal tearing and contracted gonorrhea that was indicative of sexual abuse, and Mother did not immediately seek medical care for her; (2) Mother allowed Father, a registered sex offender, to reside in the home with the four children; (3) Mother had a prior history with the Department; (4) E.M. neglected the health and well-being of Q. by failing to obtain medical care when she was suffering from rectal bleeding; (5) E.M. used controlled substances; (6) Father had a criminal history and was a registered sex offender; (7) Father cut off his ankle monitor so that he could be with the minors; (8) Father sexually abused, which included oral copulation, L1, L2, L3 and Q.; and (9) Mother was aware that Father was molesting all four children. In addition, it was alleged under section 300, subdivision (d) that Father had abused Q., L1, L2 and L3, and that Mother failed to protect the children as she was aware of the abuse. Under section 300, subdivision (j) it was alleged Q. had suffered serious physical harm and the other children were at similar risk of suffering the same harm.

The jurisdictional/dispositional hearing was conducted on September 21, 2012. E.M. submitted on the petition. The parties stipulated that L1 stated in her RCAT interview that she had witnessed Father put his private part into Q.'s private part. She also stated that Father "humped" and licked her, L3 and L2. He put his penis in her mouth and told her to suck it. L1 indicated that Mother was present one time and told

Father to get off of her. Another time Mother punched him. L1 told Mother about Father “humping” L2 and she told him to stop or she would call the police.

Mother presented stipulated testimony that she knew nothing about the allegations of sexual abuse. She was no longer with Father. She had never beat up Father. Father’s stipulated testimony was also presented. He denied he committed any sexual abuse against the four children. He never lived with Mother because of his parole conditions.

The juvenile court found the allegations in the amended petition true. It rejected that Q. could have been assaulted by a dog; it found by clear and convincing evidence that Father was the perpetrator. Mother allowed Father access to the children. Father was named the presumed father. Father and Mother were denied reunification services. E.M. was granted reunification services with Q. A section 366.26 hearing was set for L1, L2 and L3; a six-month status review hearing was set for Q.⁴ Visitation was discontinued pending a criminal investigation.

Father and Mother were advised of the right to file a writ petition pursuant to California Rules of Court, rule 8.452. Mother filed an intention to file a writ but later withdrew the petition.

⁴ Q. was placed in a group home under a planned permanent living arrangement. She continued to struggle with her peers and was having trouble in school. E.M. could not immediately take custody of Q. but reunification at a future date was possible.

C. *Section 366.26 Reports*

On December 26, 2012, the Department filed a report for the section 366.26 hearing for L1, L2 and L3. The Department recommended that the parental rights of Mother and Father be terminated and that the permanent plan was for adoption. Since the last report, L2 and L3 remained together in the foster home but L1 had to be placed in another home.

The Department provided a placement history. All four children were initially placed together on March 21, 2012. They were moved to second homes on March 22, 2012, due to the home not being able to accommodate all of them. On April 30, 2012, L1, L3 and L2 were all placed together in a new home. On May 7, 2012, they were placed in a new home but no reason was given for the move. L2 and L3 remained in this placement and the caregivers wanted to adopt them but not L1. L1 was in another placement.

According to the report, L1 was moved because the caregivers claimed she attacked L2. On October 10, 2012, L1 had held L2 down, covered her mouth, told her to shut up, punched her, and then pulled down her pants and began humping and licking her. L1 attempted to break L2's neck. L2 had no obvious injuries. By December 19, 2012, the caregivers were willing to work to take L1 back into the home.

L1 had no medical issues. It had been reported that she had touched other children in her class at school in a sexually inappropriate manner. L1 was not exhibiting any inappropriate sexual behaviors in the new placement and expressed she was glad to be

away from her siblings so she would not be tempted to touch them. L1 felt she was being punished by being moved to another home. L1 was in counseling.

L2 had no medical or developmental delays except for the past instances of masturbating and humping the furniture and siblings. At the time, she was not exhibiting any inappropriate sexual behavior. Since L1 was moved, L2 was acting out less. L3 had no medical problems or delays. She did have temper tantrums.

Q. had been visiting with L2, L1 and L3. The visits were appropriate and they all enjoyed seeing each other. The Department was seeking a continuance of the section 366.26 hearing in order to find an adoptive home for all three children. The continuance was granted.

On May 16, 2013, an addendum report was filed. On March 29, 2013, L2, L1 and L3 had been moved to a new foster home together because of concerns in the prior foster home regarding discipline of another minor in the home. On April 15, 2013, the caregiver reported that she could no longer care for the children because she was not equipped to meet the needs of the children. They were moved to a new foster home on April 23, 2013. The new caregiver reported that they were adjusting well to their new home. L3 had been yelling at the caregiver and telling her to shut up but would then apologize for misbehaving. The Department asked for another continuance in order to find an adoptive home. The continuance was granted.

Another addendum report was filed on July 2, 2013. L1, L2 and L3 remained together in their foster home in San Bernardino County where they were placed on April

23, 2013. L1 and L2 were developing normally. There were no new reports of sexually inappropriate behaviors. On July 22, 2013, the matter was again continued.

An addendum report was filed on September 11, 2013. The children remained in the same foster home. They were receiving intensive in-home therapy. There were no new reports of sexually inappropriate behavior. However, L3 had extreme temper tantrums. The tantrums lasted for 30 minutes and occurred several times a day. L1 and L2 talked back to the caregivers. They sometimes got angry and would scream and cry.

The Department recommended that visits between Q. and the three children be at the discretion of the children's therapist. Q. was reported to be angry and had been mean to her sisters during visits. The visits may be causing harm and emotional stress for L1, L2 and L3. Another continuance was granted.

Another addendum report was filed on December 11, 2013. On December 3, 2013, L1, L2 and L3 were placed in a prospective adoptive home. The children loved their new home. They called their new caregivers "mommy" and "daddy." The children were still testing the boundaries of the prospective adoptive parents but were adjusting well.

L3 had been hospitalized from October 17, 2013 through November 4, 2013, because she contracted the Rhino Virus and she had complications with asthma. The prospective adoptive parents had completed Medically Fragile Training to prevent the children from being separated. L1 and L2 had also been diagnosed with asthma and were prescribed medication.

All three children had continued to participate in intensive counseling. Their therapist had stated that all three were presenting as happy and well-adjusted children. There were no reports of sexually inappropriate behaviors for the prior seven months. Some of the in-home services were cancelled as they were no longer needed.

The Department recommended another 120 day continuance to complete a preliminary adoption assessment. On December 16, 2013, the continuance was granted.

On January 7, 2014, a preliminary adoption assessment report was filed by the Department. L1, L2, and L3 had been in the prospective adoptive home since December 3, 2013. L1 was taking medication for asthma. She exhibited no sexual behaviors and there were no developmental concerns. She was in third grade and there were no educational concerns. L2 was also taking asthma medication and she had no developmental concerns. She was in the second grade and there were no educational concerns. They were both still in counseling and doing well. L3 also had asthma. She had no developmental concerns and her tantrums had diminished. She was attending preschool.

All three girls loved the prospective adoptive home. They shared stories with the social worker of the things they did with their new family. The girls wanted to change their names. The prospective adoptive family was able to meet their needs, and could provide a safe, stable and loving environment. There had been no reports of acting out sexually since being in the home.

Mother continued to deny that Father had sexually abused the children and there was evidence that she was still in a relationship with him.

Mother filed a section 388 petition on March 10, 2014, requesting reunification services and/or visitation. She contended that she was not in a relationship with Father and that she had been consistent in her therapy.

On March 11, 2014, the Department filed its final addendum report recommending termination of parental rights and freeing the children for adoption. L1, L2 and L3 were bonded to the adoptive parents. They referred to the parents as mommy and daddy. The Department reported that the family enjoyed spending time together playing games, reading and spending the day at the park. The children were all making great improvements in their overall emotional well-being. The prospective adoptive parents had sought out therapeutic services for themselves and the children. They understood the emotional and physical trauma to which the children had been exposed. They were committed to the children transitioning into the family. The children were also becoming bonded to extended family members.

D. Section 366.26 and 388 Hearings

The section 366.26 hearing and the hearing on Mother's section 388 petition were heard together on March 18, 2014. Mother's section 388 petition was denied, the parental rights of Mother and Father were terminated and L1, L2 and L3 were freed for adoption.

Father, Mother and Q. all filed notices of appeal.

II

ADOPTABILITY

Father, Mother and Q. complain the juvenile court erred by finding that L1, L2 and L3 were adoptable.

Initially, Q. does not have standing to raise this claim on appeal. Moreover, the juvenile court properly determined that L1, L2 and L3 were adoptable.

A. *Additional Factual Background*

At the section 366.26 hearing, Father, Mother and Q. were present. Q. presented stipulated testimony that she did not want L1, L2 and L3 to be adopted. Q. helped Mother take care of her sisters and they all grew up together. Q. was afraid they were going to be separated forever. Q.'s counsel argued that the juvenile court should seriously consider the sibling bond and whether the lack of contact would be detrimental to L1, L2 and L3. Q.'s counsel asked that the sibling exception to adoption be applied. Counsel for L1, L2 and L3 agreed with the Department that parental rights should be terminated and that they should be found adoptable.

Mother's counsel noted that L1, L2 and L3 had been in nine different placements throughout the dependency proceedings. Mother's counsel was concerned they had only been in the current placement for a few months, and if they were taken out of that placement, they would be legal orphans. It was premature to consider them adoptable. Mother's counsel asked for a continuance of the section 366.26 hearing to ensure the adoptive home was stable. Further, the sibling exception to termination of parental rights was applicable.

The juvenile court first recognized that finding a stable home for L1, L2 and L3 had been difficult because they had to “overcome the emotional scars that were with them due to the abuse that they suffered.” The juvenile court noted that with the counseling, the children had made a lot of progress and gave credit to the prospective adoptive home. The prior three months had shown stability and strong bonds between the children and the adoptive parents. The juvenile court found “I think the new home has contributed and helped, but I do think that these children are adoptable since they have, in fact, come a long way in therapy and services that they received.” The juvenile court found that “By any measure, all three children are clearly adoptable.” The juvenile court also found that no exception to adoption applied. Although the court was sympathetic to Q., it had to consider the best interests of L1, L2 and L3, and that was permanency in an adoptive home.

The juvenile court terminated parental rights and freed L1, L2 and L3 for adoption. The juvenile court requested that the Department pursue contact between Q. and the children with the adoptive parents.

B. *Q. Lacks Standing to Contest the Adoptability Finding*

““In juvenile dependency proceedings, as in civil actions generally [citation], only a party aggrieved by the judgment has standing to appeal. [Citations.]” [Citations.] ‘To be aggrieved, a party must have a *legally cognizable interest* that is injuriously affected by the court’s decision. [Citation.] The injury must be immediate and substantial, and not nominal or remote.’ [Citation.] ‘An appellant must show prejudicial error affecting his or her interest in order to prevail on appeal. [Citation.] An appellant

cannot urge errors which affect only another party who does not appeal.’ [Citation.]” (*In re D.M.* (2012) 205 Cal.App.4th 283, 293-294 (*D.M.*))

If the court finds at a section 366.26 hearing that a dependent child is adoptable, it must terminate parental rights unless it determines a specified exception to the adoption preference is applicable. (§ 366.26, subd. (c)(1)(B).) The juvenile court’s finding in this case that L1, L2 and L3 were generally adoptable does not injure any cognizable right of Q. As stated in *D.M.*, the court’s finding of general adoptability “—before addressing whether any exception to adoption applies – does not injure any cognizable right” of a sibling. (*D.M.*, *supra*, 205 Cal.App.4th at p. 294.) Q. only had a right to petition the court as to an exception to adoption, i.e. the sibling relationship exception in section 366.26, subdivision (c)(1)(B)(v), not the adoptability finding. (*Ibid.*)

Here, Q. joined in Mother’s brief to the extent it inured to her benefit. Mother only raised that the juvenile court erred by finding that L1, L2 and L3 were adoptable. Q. has no standing to raise this issue on appeal. Thus, we lack jurisdiction to consider this portion of Q.’s appeal.

Q. also referred to the sibling exception under section 366.26, subdivision (c)(1)(B)(v) in the body of her argument. However, she provided no argument to support her claim, and Mother did not argue that the exception should have been applied. As such, we need not review the claim.

C. *Adoptability*

At a section 366.26 hearing, the juvenile court is charged with determining the most appropriate permanent plan for a dependent child who has been unable to reunify. (*In re Casey D.* (1999) 70 Cal.App.4th 38, 50.) A section 366.26 hearing is designed to protect a dependent child’s “compelling” right “to have a placement that is stable, permanent, and allows the caretaker to make a full emotional commitment to the child.” (*In re A.A.* (2008) 167 Cal.App.4th 1292, 1320.) “Adoption, where possible, is the permanent plan preferred by the Legislature. [Citation.]” (*In re Autumn H.* (1994) 27 Cal.App.4th 567, 573.)

“The juvenile court may terminate parental rights only if it determines by clear and convincing evidence that it is likely the child will be adopted within a reasonable time. [Citations.] ““Clear and convincing” evidence requires a finding of high probability. The evidence must be so clear as to leave no substantial doubt. It must be sufficiently strong to command the unhesitating assent of every reasonable mind. [Citations]” [Citations.]’ [Citation.] Review of a determination of adoptability is limited to whether those findings are supported by substantial evidence. [Citation.]” (*In re Carl R.* (2005) 128 Cal.App.4th 1051, 1060-1061.)

General adoptability “focuses on the *minor*, e.g., whether the minor’s age, physical condition, and emotional state make it difficult to find a person willing to adopt the minor.” (*In re Sarah M.* (1994) 22 Cal.App.4th 1642, 1649.) “[I]t is not necessary that the minor already be in a potential adoptive home or that there be a proposed adoptive parent ‘waiting in the wings.’ [Citations.]” (*Ibid.*)

Here, L1, L2 and L3 were generally adoptable. Although they had suffered serious sexual abuse at the hands of Father, they had received intensive counseling and were showing significant improvement. Their therapist had indicated by the time of the section 366.26 hearing that they were all happy and well-adjusted. There were no new reports of sexually inappropriate behaviors within the prior year. They had been moved to several different placements at the beginning of the proceedings, but had remained in the same foster home for eight months prior to being moved to the prospective adoptive home. Further, although all three children suffered from asthma, it appeared to be controlled by medication. Finally, L1 and L2 were having no trouble in school. Based on their current situation, the juvenile court reasonably could find that clear and convincing evidence supported that L1, L2 and L3 were generally adoptable.

Moreover, even if we were to consider that L1, L2 and L3 were not generally adoptable, they were specifically adoptable by the prospective adoptive family. “[I]n some cases a minor who ordinarily might be considered unadoptable due to age, poor physical health, physical disability, or emotional instability is nonetheless likely to be adopted because a prospective adoptive family has been identified as willing to adopt the child.” (*In re Sarah M.*, *supra*, 22 Cal.App.4th at p. 1650.) Thus, a child may be “deemed adoptable based solely on the fact that a particular family is willing to adopt him or her” (*In re Carl R.*, *supra*, 128 Cal.App.4th at p. 1061.)

Here, a prospective adoptive family had been found that was willing to adopt all three children, with full knowledge of their background and health issues. The prospective adoptive parents had attended a class to deal with any medical issues that the

children may suffer due to their asthma. The family enjoyed spending time together playing games and going to the park. They were all bonded and the children called the adoptive parents mommy and daddy. This alone constituted substantial evidence that they were adoptable.

Father and Mother have argued that the prospective adoptive family was still in the “honeymoon” period since they only had all three children for three months. While they had the girls for a short period of time, it was clear they had bonded with the children. All three children were reported to be adjusting well to the home. Additionally, they had benefitted from counseling and were no longer exhibiting the behaviors that were problematic in the first few foster homes.

Further, Father and Mother refer to the fact that L1, L2 and L3 had been in numerous placements prior to the prospective adoptive home. They express concern this placement will not be successful. Several of the previous placements had been unsuccessful due to Q.’s presence in the home. Further, there were placements that did not work out because of other children in the home. Additionally, when L1, L2 and L3 were initially removed from their home, they were clearly suffering from the great trauma that was caused by Mother and Father. They were acting out inappropriately. However, after removal from their parents, and intensive counseling, the girls had finally stabilized. They were finally happy and stable in the prospective adoptive home because they were in a loving environment and had received counseling in order to deal with their past trauma. Substantial evidence supported that L1, L2 and L3 had finally found the much needed stability in the prospective adoptive home.

We find the juvenile court's conclusion that L1, L2 and L3 were adoptable was supported by substantial evidence.

III

DISPOSITION

The juvenile court's orders are affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

MCKINSTER
Acting P. J.

We concur:

MILLER
J.

CODRINGTON
J.