

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

L.L., FATHER OF D.J., M.J., A.J., B.J.,
AND E.J., CHILDREN,

Appellant,

v.

Case No. 5D21-658

DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND
FAMILIES, AND GUARDIAN AD LITEM,

Appellees.

Opinion filed June 24, 2021

Appeal from the Circuit Court
for Osceola County,
Laura Shaffer, Judge.

Richard F. Joyce, of the Office of
Criminal Conflict and Civil Regional
Counsel, Casselberry, for Appellant.

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

Thomasina F. Moore and Sarah Todd
Weitz, of Statewide Guardian ad
Litem Office, Tallahassee, for
Appellee Guardian ad Litem.

PER CURIAM.

L.L. ("Father"), the father of the minor children D.J., M.J., A.J., B.J., and E.J., appeals that portion of the supplemental disposition order adjudicating the children dependent that requires, as part of the case plan approved by the trial court, Father to complete a psychological evaluation and follow any recommendations. The record shows that Father freely, voluntarily, and knowingly executed a written consent to his children being adjudicated dependent and that the trial court accepted Father's consent after sufficient colloquy. In this document, Father acknowledged, among other things, that he understood that the trial court, either on its own motion or on motion of another party, could modify the case plan and order him to comply with repeated or additional tasks, including, but not limited to, a psychological and psychiatric evaluation. Nevertheless, Father objected to the evaluation.

Based upon our review of the entire record, which, without further elaboration, shows good cause for the court-ordered evaluation, we affirm the supplemental disposition order, including that portion of the order requiring Father to complete a psychological evaluation and to follow any recommendations resulting from the evaluation. We do, however, agree with the parties that a remand to the trial court is necessary so that the court can

amend the order to specify the “time, place, manner, conditions[,] and scope of the examination and the person or persons by whom it is to be made.” See *J.M. v. Dep’t of Child. & Fams.*, 8 So. 3d 500, 501 (Fla. 5th DCA 2009) (first quoting Fla. R. Juv. P. 8.250(b); and then citing *D.C. v. Dep’t of Child. & Fams.*, 966 So. 2d 1032, 1033 (Fla. 4th DCA 2007)).

AFFIRMED; REMANDED with instructions to amend order consistent with this opinion.

LAMBERT, HARRIS and TRAVER, JJ., concur.