

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA  
FIFTH DISTRICT

NOT FINAL UNTIL TIME EXPIRES TO  
FILE MOTION FOR REHEARING AND  
DISPOSITION THEREOF IF FILED

T.V., FATHER OF H.V., A CHILD,

Appellant,

v.

Case No. 5D21-275

DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN  
AND FAMILIES,

Appellee.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

Opinion filed May 14, 2021

Appeal from the Circuit Court  
for Orange County,  
James A. Craner, Judge.

Michael E. Morris, of Law Office of  
Michael E. Morris, Orlando, for  
Appellant.

Kelley Schaeffer, of Children's Legal  
Services, Department of Children and  
Families, Bradenton, for Appellee.

Lynn James Hinson, Orlando, for  
Guardian ad Litem.

PER CURIAM.

T.V. (the Father) appeals the final judgment terminating his parental rights (TPR Order). We affirm in all respects and note that the trial court's analysis was sound, but remand for the trial court to correct scrivener's errors in the written judgment, which the Father identified in his initial brief and the Florida Department of Children and Families (DCF) conceded require entry of a corrected order.

At the beginning of the TPR Order, the trial court cites the incorrect statutory grounds as a basis for the termination of both the Mother's and Father's parental rights. Later in the TPR order, in the section entitled, "Grounds for Termination of Parental Rights," the trial court cites and discusses the correct legal grounds for termination, making it clear that the trial court's initial misidentification of the correct statutory subsections had no substantive effect on the trial court's analysis and decision.

In the ten-page TPR Order, the trial court mistakenly references a parent and children not subject to this case. Specifically, on page four of the TPR Order, the trial court incorrectly includes another father's name when noting that the Father had notice of the proceeding. On page eight of the TPR Order, the trial court includes the wrong children's names when ordering a commitment to DCF and discussing visitation. These mistakes too are mere scrivener's errors and had no substantive effect as evidenced by the

trial court's analysis of the best interests of both children in section 17 of the TPR Order.

Finally, in section 15 of the TPR Order the trial court includes K.L.-V. when discussing grounds for terminating the Father's parental rights. The trial court, however, repeatedly recognized that T.V. was not the legal father of K.L.-V. For example, the trial court noted at the hearing and explained in the TPR Order that another individual was the legal father of K.L.-V. Additionally, the trial court limited the termination of the Father's parental rights to H.V. in section 17 of the TPR Order. Considering the totality of the hearing and TPR Order, it is clear the inclusion of K.L.-V when discussing the grounds for terminating the Father's parental rights in section 15 of the TPR Order was a scrivener's error.

Because the trial court correctly addressed the substance of each statutory ground and made the appropriate factual findings as to the termination of T.V.'s parental rights of H.V., we find that the errors identified were scrivener's errors. *See Tunstall v. Gonzalez-Tunstall*, 278 So. 3d 254, 254 (Fla. 2d DCA 2019). Accordingly, we affirm and remand only for the correction of the scrivener's errors.

AFFIRMED and REMANDED with instructions.

EVANDER, C.J, EISNAUGLE and NARDELLA, JJ., concur.