IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

----00000----

State of Utah, in the interest of B.P, a person under eighteen years of age.) MEMORANDUM DECISION) (Not For Official Publication)
) Case No. 20050669-CA
E.M.W.,) FILED
Appellant,	(June 2, 2006)
v.) 2006 UT App 226
State of Utah,	
Appellee.)

Seventh District Juvenile, Monticello Department, 464732 The Honorable Mary L. Manley

Attorneys: William L. Schultz, Moab, for Appellant Mark L. Shurtleff and John M. Peterson, Salt Lake City, for Appellee Martha Pierce and Daniel Anderson, Salt Lake City, Guardians Ad Litem

Before Judges Greenwood, McHugh, and Orme.

PER CURIAM:

E.M.W. appeals a permanency order terminating services.¹

We recently determined that "a permanency order which terminates reunification services and sets a final permanency

1. The order at issue is, in substance, a permanency order. After a dispositional hearing that tentatively adopted a service plan and established reunification as the tentative goal for the child, the juvenile court conducted a subsequent hearing on July 19, 2005. The result of this hearing was an order that determined that reunification services will not be provided, set the primary goal as adoption, and directed the Division of Child and Family Services to file a petition for termination of parental rights within forty-five days. <u>See</u> Utah Code Ann. § 78-3a-312 (Supp. 2005). Clearly, the nature of the proceedings changed at the July 19 hearing from potential reunification to a determination that services were not appropriate and that termination of parental rights was the next logical step. <u>See In</u> <u>re A.F.</u>, 2006 UT App 200,¶¶5-6 (describing nature of dispositional and permanency hearings). plan of adoption is not a final, appealable order." <u>In re A.F.</u>, 2006 UT App 200,¶17.

Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal of the permanency order in this case for lack of jurisdiction.

Pamela T. Greenwood, Associate Presiding Judge

Carolyn B. McHugh, Judge

Gregory K. Orme, Judge