

NON-PRECEDENTIAL DECISION - SEE SUPERIOR COURT I.O.P. 65.37

IN RE: A.C., K.C., and J.C.,	:	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF
	:	PENNSYLVANIA
Minor Children	:	
	:	
	:	
APPEAL OF: J.C.,	:	
	:	
Mother	:	No. 2037 EDA 2012

Appeal from the Order entered June 28, 2012
in the Court of Common Pleas of Northampton County
Orphans' Court at No.: 2005-0144

BEFORE: DONOHUE, OLSON, and FITZGERALD,* JJ.

JUDGMENT ORDER BY FITZGERALD, J. Filed: January 4, 2013

J.C. ("Mother") appeals from the order entered in the Court of Common Pleas of Northampton County, terminating her parental rights to her children, A.C., K.C., and Jad.C. pursuant to 23 Pa.C.S. § 2511(a)(1), (2), (5), and (b), and changing the children's permanency goal to adoption. We vacate the order and remand this case to the trial court for a comprehensive best interests analysis pursuant to Section 2511(b).

"[U]nder Section 2511, the court must engage in a bifurcated process prior to terminating parental rights." *In re Adoption of R.J.S.*, 901 A.2d 502, 508 (Pa. Super. 2006). This Court has stated:

Once the statutory requirement for involuntary termination of parental rights has been established under subsection (a), the court must consider whether the child's needs and

* Former Justice specially assigned to the Superior Court.

welfare will be met by termination pursuant to subsection (b). In this context, the court must take into account whether a bond exists between child and parent, and whether termination would destroy an existing, necessary and beneficial relationship.

In re Z.P., 994 A.2d 1108, 1121 (Pa. Super. 2010) (citations omitted). “In . . . cases where we have found a trial court’s ‘best interests’ analysis to be lacking, we have remanded the case to the trial court for the taking of additional evidence with regard to emotional bonds and the effect of termination on the children.” ***In re I.J.***, 972 A.2d 5, 13 (Pa. Super. 2009).

Instantly, the Northampton County Children, Youth and Families Division conceded that it had not “had a bonding assessment done” N.T., 12/12/11, at 185; Trial Ct. Op., 6/28/12, at 19. The trial court did not engage in a best interest analysis as required by Section 2511(b). The court summarily concluded: “The termination of Mother’s and Father’s parental rights is in the best interests of the Minor Children. **See** 23 Pa.C.S.A. § 2511(b).” Trial Ct. Op. at 27. For the foregoing reasons, we vacate the order granting termination and “remand this case to the trial court for a comprehensive ‘best interests’ analysis.” **See *In re I.J.***, 972 A.2d at 13. The court shall determine whether a bond exists between Mother and the children, and all other considerations under Section 2511(b). The court may conduct additional proceedings and shall enter a ruling on the termination petition within sixty days of the date of this judgment order.

J. S70044/12

Order vacated. Case remanded for proceedings consistent with this judgment order. Jurisdiction relinquished.