

\*\*\*\*\*

The “officially released” date that appears near the beginning of each opinion is the date the opinion will be published in the Connecticut Law Journal or the date it was released as a slip opinion. The operative date for the beginning of all time periods for filing postopinion motions and petitions for certification is the “officially released” date appearing in the opinion. In no event will any such motions be accepted before the “officially released” date.

All opinions are subject to modification and technical correction prior to official publication in the Connecticut Reports and Connecticut Appellate Reports. In the event of discrepancies between the electronic version of an opinion and the print version appearing in the Connecticut Law Journal and subsequently in the Connecticut Reports or Connecticut Appellate Reports, the latest print version is to be considered authoritative.

The syllabus and procedural history accompanying the opinion as it appears on the Commission on Official Legal Publications Electronic Bulletin Board Service and in the Connecticut Law Journal and bound volumes of official reports are copyrighted by the Secretary of the State, State of Connecticut, and may not be reproduced and distributed without the express written permission of the Commission on Official Legal Publications, Judicial Branch, State of Connecticut.

\*\*\*\*\*

IN RE SUELAKA G.\*  
(AC 32100)

Bishop, Lavine and Foti, Js.

*Argued September 1—officially released October 5, 2010*

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of  
Hartford, Juvenile Matters, Dannehy, J.)

*Kathryn Steadman*, for the appellant (respondent  
mother).

*Tammy Nguyen-O'Dowd*, assistant attorney general,  
with whom, on the brief, were *Richard Blumenthal*,  
attorney general, and *Susan T. Pearlman*, assistant  
attorney general, for the appellee (petitioner).

*Opinion*

PER CURIAM. The respondent mother appeals from the judgment of the trial court terminating her parental rights with respect to her minor child, Suelaka.<sup>1</sup> The respondent claims that the court improperly found that she had failed to achieve such a degree of personal rehabilitation as would encourage the belief that within a reasonable time, considering the age and needs of the child, she could assume a responsible position in the child's life. See General Statutes § 17a-112 (j) (3) (B). We affirm the judgment of the trial court.

Our standard of review on appeal from a judgment terminating parental rights is well settled. The trial court's findings must stand unless they are clearly erroneous. *In re Sole S.*, 119 Conn. App. 187, 191, 986 A.2d 351 (2010). "A finding is clearly erroneous when either there is no evidence in the record to support it, or the reviewing court is left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been made." (Internal quotation marks omitted.) *Id.*

The respondent claims that the trial court improperly found by clear and convincing evidence that she had failed to achieve a sufficient degree of personal rehabilitation to assume a responsible position in the life of the child pursuant to § 17a-112 (j) (3) (B). She argues that in making its determination, the court did not consider her efforts toward personal rehabilitation made between the filing of the petition for termination of parental rights on January 16, 2009, and the trial on January 25 and 29, 2010. In its memorandum of decision, however, the trial court noted that the respondent had made some progress in her personal life during that interval but observed that she still lacked the skills and consistency to take responsibility for a toddler within a reasonable time.<sup>2</sup> "[I]n assessing rehabilitation, the critical issue is not whether the parent has improved her ability to manage her own life, but rather whether she has gained the ability to care for the particular needs of the child at issue." (Internal quotation marks omitted.) *In re Keyashia C.*, 120 Conn. App. 452, 457, 991 A.2d 1113, cert. denied, 297 Conn. 909, 995 A.2d 637 (2010).

We see no useful purpose in repeating the facts or reciting the applicable law, as the trial court thoroughly set forth the relevant facts and the applicable law in its thoughtful and well reasoned memorandum of decision. See *In re Alexander C.*, 262 Conn. 308, 311, 813 A.2d 87 (2003). Based on our careful review, we conclude that the record amply supports the factual determinations made by the court, and we conclude that the court correctly applied the law to the facts it properly found.

The judgment is affirmed.

\* In accordance with the spirit and intent of General Statutes § 46b-142 (b) and Practice Book § 79-3, the names of the parties involved in this appeal are not disclosed. The records and papers of this case shall be open for

inspection only to persons having a proper interest therein and upon order of the Appellate Court.

<sup>1</sup>The court also terminated the parental rights of the child's father. Because he has not appealed, we refer in this opinion to the respondent mother as the respondent.

<sup>2</sup>It is noteworthy that the respondent herself was committed to the custody of the petitioner, the commissioner of children and families, as a neglected child at the time of Suelaka's birth and never had custody of Suelaka.

---