IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA
FIFTH DISTRICT JANUARY TERM 2013

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

C.L., MOTHER AND J.V., FATHER OF G.V., ETC.,

Appellant,

v. Case No. 5D12-3536

DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES,

Appellee.

_____/

Opinion filed April 29, 2013

Appeal from the Circuit Court
for Seminole County,
Nancy F. Alley, Judge.

Allan Campbell, Lake Mary,
for Appellant, C.L.

M. Celine Cannon, of Cannon Law Firm,
Fern Park, for Appellant, J.V.

Rosemarie Farrell, Department of Children
and Families, Orlando, for Appellee.

Laura E. Lawson, Tavares, for Guardian
ad Litem Program.

ORFINGER, C.J.

C.L. and J.V., the mother and father of G.V., timely appeal a final order which denied their motions for reunification and placed G.V. in the permanent guardianship of her maternal aunt. We affirm the trial court's order denying the mother's and father's

motions for reunification without further discussion, as the trial court's decision is supported by competent, substantial evidence.

We must, however, reverse that portion of the final order placing G.V. in a permanent guardianship because the order fails to comply with the requirements of section 39.6221. Section 39.6221, Florida Statutes (2012), requires trial courts to set forth written findings to support any decision to place a child in a permanent guardianship arrangement. An order that does not comply with the requirements of section 39.6221 must be reversed. In re J.L.R., Jr., 64 So. 3d 1283, 1284 (Fla. 2d DCA 2011); R.T., Sr. v. Dep't of Children & Families, 27 So. 3d 195, 196 (Fla. 5th DCA 2010); In re J.S., 18 So. 3d 712, 714 (Fla. 2d DCA 2009). Here, the final order does not state why a permanent guardianship is being established instead of adoption as required by section 39.6221(2)(b). See Dep't of Children & Families v. J.F., 959 So. 2d 1247, 1247 (Fla. 4th DCA 2007) (reversing guardianship order and remanding for trial court to provide findings as to why permanent placement is established without adoption of child to follow pursuant to section 39.621(6), and to amend order to comply with section 39.6221(2)). The final order also fails to comply with section 39.6221(2)(f), as it does not require the maternal aunt, as the permanent guardian, not to return G.V. to the physical care of the mother and/or the father without court approval. Finally, the order does not comply with section 39.6221(2)(c), which requires the circuit court's written order to "[s]pecify the frequency and nature of visitation or contact between the child and his or her parents." This language mandates that the court establish a specific visitation schedule, which was not included in this final order. See, e.g., In re J.L.R., Jr., 64 So. 3d at 1284; In re A.N., 55 So. 3d 685, 685-86 (Fla. 2d DCA 2011). Accordingly,

we reverse that part of the order placing the child in a permanent guardianship and remand for entry of an amended order that meets the requirements of section 39.6221(2)(b), (c), and (f), Florida Statutes.

AFFIRMED IN PART, REVERSED IN PART AND REMANDED.

SAWAYA and BERGER, JJ., concur.