

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----ooOoo-----

In the interest of K.W. and D.W., persons under eighteen years of age.)	MEMORANDUM DECISION
_____)	(Not For Official Publication)
)	Case No. 20061160-CA
M.W.,)	
Appellant,)	F I L E D
)	(February 15, 2007)
v.)	2007 UT App 52
Guardian Ad Litem,)	
Appellee.)	

Third District Juvenile, Salt Lake Department, 457093
The Honorable Frederic M. Oddone

Attorneys: Colleen K. Coebergh, Salt Lake City, for Appellant
Martha Pierce, Salt Lake City, for Appellee

Before Judges Greenwood, Billings, and Orme.

PER CURIAM:

M.W. (Father) appeals the termination of his parental rights in K.W. and D.W. 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. A finding of fact is clearly erroneous only when, in light of the evidence supporting the finding, it is against the clear weight of the evidence. See id. Additionally, a juvenile court has broad discretion regarding judgments, based on the juvenile court's specialized experience and training, as well as its ability to judge credibility firsthand. See id. In reviewing an order terminating parental rights, 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.

The juvenile court found multiple grounds to warrant termination of Father's parental rights pursuant to Utah Code section 78-3a-407. See Utah Code Ann. § 78-3a-407 (Supp. 2006). The juvenile court also found termination to be in the children's best interests. Father does not challenge any finding or conclusion of the juvenile court regarding the termination of his parental rights.

Rather, Father asserts on appeal that his incarceration prevented him from receiving reunification services. He does not, however, show why this is relevant to the termination of his parental rights. Furthermore, there is no indication in the record that he objected to the denial of services, nor did he appeal from the order.¹

Father also asserts that the children should have been permitted to know him after his release. This presents no legal issue for review. The juvenile court found grounds for termination and found that termination was in the children's best interests. Inherent in those findings is the determination that the children would be better off not having contact with Father after his release. In fact, the juvenile court expressly found that Father posed a significant threat to the children. Also, to the extent that this issue may be construed as a challenge to the sufficiency of the evidence or a challenge to the juvenile court's findings or conclusions, the lack of a transcript prevents this court from addressing any such challenge further. See Utah R. App. P. 54; State v. Blubaugh, 904 P.2d 688, 699 (Utah Ct. App. 1995).

Accordingly, the termination of Father's parental rights is affirmed.

Pamela T. Greenwood,
Associate Presiding Judge

Judith M. Billings, Judge

¹The order was a final, appealable order because it adjudicated the petition against Father, provided for permanent custody of the children, and terminated juvenile court jurisdiction. See In re A.F., 2006 UT App 200, ¶10, 138 P.3d 65.

Gregory K. Orme, Judge