

COURT OF APPEALS OF VIRGINIA

Present: Judges McCullough, Decker and Senior Judge Felton

OPAL BROCK

v. Record No. 0265-15-3

WISE COUNTY DEPARTMENT
OF SOCIAL SERVICES

MEMORANDUM OPINION*
PER CURIAM
JULY 14, 2015

FROM THE CIRCUIT COURT OF WISE COUNTY
John C. Kilgore, Judge

(H. Fuller Cridlin; Cridlin Law Office, on briefs), for appellant.

(Jeremy B. O’Quinn; Hugh O’Donnell, Guardian *ad litem* for the infant children; The O’Quinn Law Office, P.L.L.C., on brief), for appellee.

Opal Brock (mother) appeals the termination of her parental rights to her children pursuant to Code § 16.1-283(B), 16.1-283(C)(1), and 16.1-283(C)(2). Mother argues the trial court erred in finding that, without good cause, she (1) failed to maintain continuing contact with and to provide or substantially plan for the future of her children and (2) was unwilling or unable within a reasonable period of time to remedy the conditions that led to the children’s foster care placement.

Mother argues there was “good cause” for her failure to complete all the programs required by the foster care plan under Code § 16.1-283(C) because she had limited financial resources, limited access to a telephone, and limited access to transportation. Citing Code § 16.1-283(C), mother also argues she made efforts that showed a willingness to remedy the condition that led to the children’s foster care placement.

* Pursuant to Code § 17.1-413, this opinion is not designated for publication.

On appeal, mother challenges the termination of her parental rights under Code § 16.1-283(C), but not under Code § 16.1-283(B). Terminations under Code § 16.1-283(B) and the subsections of Code § 16.1-283(C) provide distinct, “individual bases upon which a petitioner may seek to terminate residual parental rights.” City of Newport News Dep’t of Soc. Servs. v. Winslow, 40 Va. App. 556, 563, 580 S.E.2d 463, 466 (2003). Mother’s failure to challenge the termination under Code § 16.1-283(B) renders moot her claim regarding the termination under Code § 16.1-283(C), and we need not consider it. See Winslow, 40 Va. App. at 563, 580 S.E.2d at 466.

Accordingly, upon reviewing the record and briefs of the parties, we conclude this appeal is without merit. Accordingly, we summarily affirm the decision of the trial court. See Rule 5A:27.

Affirmed.