

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

No. 9-615 / 09-0939
Filed August 6, 2009

**IN THE INTEREST OF D.J.B. and T.L.B.-G.,
Minor Children,**

**B.F.G., Father,
Appellant.**

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Pottawattamie County, Kathleen Kilnoski, District Associate Judge.

A father appeals the termination of his parental rights to his children.

AFFIRMED.

William F. McGinn of McGinn, McGinn, Springer & Noethe, Council Bluffs, for appellant.

Thomas J. Miller, Attorney General, Kathrine S. Miller-Todd, Assistant Attorney General, Matthew Wilber, County Attorney, and Dawn Landon, Assistant County Attorney, for appellee.

Phil Caniglia, Council Bluffs, for mother.

Brian Rhoten, Council Bluffs, attorney and guardian ad litem for minor child.

Considered by Sackett, C.J., and Eisenhauer and Doyle, JJ.

EISENHAUER, J.

A father appeals the termination of his parental rights to his children. He contends the State failed to prove the grounds for termination by clear and convincing evidence. He also contends termination is not in the children's best interests. Finally, he contends the State failed to make reasonable efforts to reunite him with his children. We review his claims de novo. *In re N.V.*, 744 N.W.2d 634, 636 (Iowa 2008).

The father's parental rights were terminated pursuant to Iowa Code sections 232.116(1)(a), (d), (e), (f), and (h) (2009). We need only find termination proper under one ground to affirm. *In re R.R.K.*, 544 N.W.2d 274, 276 (Iowa Ct. App. 1995). The father only makes an argument regarding termination under section 232.116(1)(d). The failure to make an argument regarding termination under the remaining sections is deemed a waiver of the issue. *In re J.J.A.*, 580 N.W.2d 731, 740 (Iowa 1998). We affirm the termination of his parental rights pursuant to sections 232.116(1)(a), (e), (f), and (h).

We also conclude termination is in the children's best interests. The evidence presented at the termination hearing shows the father is unable to safely parent the children at this time. A child should not be forced to endlessly await the maturity of a natural parent. *In re C.B.*, 611 N.W.2d 489, 494 (Iowa 2000). At some point, the rights and needs of the child rise above the rights and needs of the parent. *In re J.L.W.*, 570 N.W.2d 778, 781 (Iowa Ct. App. 1997). That time is now. The children, ages four and five, are each in foster care placements with families who wish to adopt them. After being placed with

different foster families and a relative placement since May 2007, a permanent home is in their best interest. See *In re J.E.*, 723 N.W.2d 793, 801 (Iowa 2006) (“A child’s safety and the need for a permanent home are now the primary concerns when determining a child’s best interests.”) (Cady, J., concurring specially).

Finally, the father contends the State failed to make reasonable efforts to reunite him with the children. He does not state what services he requested that would have better served to reunify them and accordingly has not preserved this issue for our review. See *In re L.M.W.*, 518 N.W.2d 804, 807 (Iowa Ct. App. 1994) (“A challenge to the sufficiency of services should be raised in the course of the child in need of assistance proceedings.”). Therefore, we affirm.

AFFIRMED.