

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----ooOoo-----

State of Utah, in the interest)	MEMORANDUM DECISION
of A.L., a person under)	(Not For Official Publication)
eighteen years of age.)	
_____)	Case No. 20080747-CA
)	
R.L.,)	F I L E D
)	(December 11, 2008)
Appellant,)	
)	2008 UT App 457
v.)	
)	
State of Utah,)	
)	
Appellee.)	

Second District Juvenile, Ogden Department, 528955
The Honorable Paul F. Iwasaki

Attorneys: Randall W. Richards and Jennifer Allen Clark, Ogden,
for Appellant
Mark L. Shurtleff and John M. Peterson, Salt Lake
City, for Appellee
Martha Pierce, Salt Lake City, Guardian Ad Litem

Before Judges Greenwood, Billings, and Orme.

PER CURIAM:

R.L. (Mother) appeals the termination of her parental rights
in A.L. We affirm.

A juvenile court's findings of fact will not be overturned
unless they are clearly erroneous. See In re E.R., 2001 UT App
66, ¶ 11, 21 P.3d 680. Additionally, we accord juvenile courts
broad discretion regarding judgments because of their specialized
experience and training, as well as their ability to judge
credibility firsthand. See id. In reviewing a juvenile court's
order, this court "will not disturb the juvenile court's findings
and conclusions unless the evidence clearly preponderates against
the findings as made or the court has abused its discretion." In
re R.A.J., 1999 UT App 329, ¶ 6, 991 P.2d 1118. "When a
foundation for the [juvenile] court's decision exists in the

evidence, an appellate court may not engage in a reweighing of the evidence." In re B.R., 2007 UT 82, ¶ 12, 171 P.3d 435.

Mother asserts that the juvenile court abused its discretion in finding that the termination of her parental rights was in the best interests of A.L. The record shows sufficient evidence supporting the juvenile court's decision. A.L.'s development had progressed in foster care. She was integrated into the family and had bonded with her foster parents. The foster parents were willing to adopt A.L. and provide her with a stable and permanent home. Given the factual foundation in the record, the juvenile court did not abuse its discretion in finding termination to be in A.L.'s best interests.

Mother also asserts for the first time on appeal that the service plans were unreasonable and violated her due process rights. Generally, appellate courts will not consider issues, including constitutional arguments, raised for the first time on appeal. See State v. Dean, 2004 UT 63, ¶¶ 13-14, 95 P.3d 276. Because Mother did not object to the service plan requirements below, the issue is not properly before this court on appeal and we do not consider it.

Affirmed.

Pamela T. Greenwood,
Presiding Judge

Judith M. Billings, Judge

Gregory K. Orme, Judge