IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

----ooOoo----

State of Utah, in the interest of K.N., a person under eighteen years of age. _____ J.C., Appellant, v. State of Utah, Appellee.	MEMORANDUM DECISION (Not For Official Publication) Case No. 20060251-CA F I L E D (May 25, 2006) 2006 UT App 208

Third District Juvenile, Salt Lake Department, 457428
The Honorable Charles D. Behrens

Attorneys: Jeffrey J. Noland, Salt Lake City, for Appellant
Mark L. Shurtleff and John M. Peterson, Salt Lake City, for Appellee
Martha Pierce and Brent J. Newton, Salt Lake City, Guardians Ad Litem

---

Before Judges Greenwood, McHugh, and Orme.

PER CURIAM:

J.C. (Mother) appeals the termination of her parental rights. Mother claims that the juvenile court erred in concluding that the Division of Child and Family Services (DCFS) made reasonable efforts to provide her with appropriate reunification services. She specifically claims that she was not provided any services after K.N. was removed from her physical custody and was not provided adequate time to address her drug use prior to the termination of reunification services.

"If an appellant intends to urge on appeal that a finding or conclusion is unsupported by or is contrary to the evidence, the appellant must include in the record a transcript of all evidence relevant to such finding or conclusion." Utah R. App. P. 54(a).

Because Mother did not provide a transcript of the termination trial, "we assume that the proceedings at the trial were regular and that the judgment was supported by competent and sufficient evidence." Bevan v. J.H. Constr. Co., 669 P.2d 442, 443 (Utah 1983); see also State v. Rawlings, 829 P.2d 150, 152-53 (Utah Ct. App. 1992), overruled on other grounds by State v. Gordon, 913 P.2d 350 (Utah 1996) ("In the absence of an adequate record on appeal, we cannot address the issues raised and presume the correctness of the disposition."). Mother's claim that the juvenile court erred in concluding that the State provided reasonable reunification efforts presents a mixed question of fact and law. See In re A.C., 2004 UT App 255,¶9, 97 P.3d 706; In re M.C., 2003 UT App 429,¶16, 82 P.3d 1159. "[T]he trial court has broad discretion in determining whether DCFS [has] made reasonable efforts at reunification." In re A.C., 2004 UT App 255 at ¶12.

Mother concedes that DCFS first became involved in the case in December 2004. It is undisputed that DCFS prepared a court-ordered service plan requiring Mother to obtain a drug and alcohol assessment and follow its recommendations, to submit to random urinalysis, and to obtain stable housing and employment. Following the March 2005 adjudication, she was allowed to retain physical custody of K.N. on a trial home placement. Following the disposition hearing, she disappeared with K.N. and failed to maintain contact with her caseworker for over two months. K.N. was physically removed in June 2005 after he was found wandering outside unsupervised. This incident occurred several months after DCFS began offering reunification services. Mother did not obtain the drug and alcohol assessment, and she did not submit to random urinalysis. Mother did not make any effort to access services. We conclude that the court did not abuse its broad discretion in determining that the State made reasonable efforts at reunification.

To the extent that Mother contends she was entitled to services for a longer period of time, the claim is without merit. "Reunification services are a gratuity provided to parents by the Legislature, and appellants thus have no constitutional right to receive these services." In re N.R., 967 P.2d 951, 955-56 (Utah Ct. App. 1998); see also Utah Code Ann. § 78-3a-312(7)(a)(Supp. 2005) ("Nothing in this section may be construed to . . . entitle

any parent to reunification services for any specified period of time.").

We affirm the termination of parental rights.

_____
Pamela T. Greenwood,
Associate Presiding Judge

_____
Carolyn B. McHugh, Judge

_____
Gregory K. Orme, Judge