



¶ 3

## I. BACKGROUND

¶ 4 In April 2011, then-nine-year-old J.S. and an older minor sibling were found unsupervised in a hotel room; at that time, respondent father reported that his work kept him too busy to supervise her, and respondent mother reported that she was tired and done with parenting, having in her opinion fulfilled her obligations to her children. The Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) took J.S. into temporary custody. The State filed its petition for adjudication of wardship. In relevant part, the State alleged J.S. was neglected in that she was not receiving the proper care recognized as necessary for her well-being. See 705 ILCS 405/2-3(1)(a) (West 2010). In addition to her being left alone in the hotel room for indefinite periods, the petition noted that J.S. had missed 58 1/2 days of 137 school days that year.

¶ 5 In May 2011, respondent parents admitted at an adjudicatory hearing that J.S. was neglected as alleged. The trial court made J.S. a ward of the court and gave custody and guardianship to DCFS. At a dispositional hearing that same day, the court found respondent parents unfit, unable, and unwilling to care for J.S.

¶ 6 Respondent parents were assigned service plans and ordered to comply with them. Respondent mother's service plan included a drug and alcohol assessment, individual counseling, family counseling as needed, and parenting classes. Respondent father's service plan included parenting classes, individual counseling, and Alcoholics Anonymous. The parents' plans also included supervised visitation with J.S.

¶ 7 For almost a year afterward, respondent parents failed to complete any service-plan objectives. They sporadically attended meetings with their caseworkers and visits with J.S. They were frequently unavailable for contact with their caseworkers. One caseworker suspected

that respondent mother was drunk at all their meetings except one—a couple times alcohol-detection swabs showed respondent mother had been drinking, and at other meetings respondent mother refused to submit to the tests. Respondent mother's behavior and attitude were volatile at these meetings, sometimes resulting in inappropriate outbursts. The caseworker believed respondent mother also was intoxicated at several supervised visits with J.S.

¶ 8           Meanwhile, in August 2011, J.S. was placed in foster care with her adult brother and his wife. The placement provided her with stability. J.S. regularly attended school. She improved her grades to mostly A's and B's. Her foster parents expressed interest in adopting her.

¶ 9           In April 2012, the State moved for a finding of unfitness and termination of respondents' parental rights with respect to J.S. The State alleged the parents were unfit in that (1) they failed to maintain a reasonable degree of interest, concern, or responsibility for J.S.'s welfare (see 750 ILCS 50/1(D)(b) (West 2010)); (2) they failed to make reasonable efforts to correct the conditions that were the basis for J.S.'s removal within nine months of the adjudication of neglect (see 750 ILCS 50/1(D)(m)(i) (West 2010)); (3) they failed to make reasonable progress toward her return home over the same period (see 750 ILCS 50/1(D)(m)(ii) (West 2010)); and (4) respondent mother was habitually drunk for at least one year prior to the filing of the petition for termination of parental rights (see 750 ILCS 50/1(D)(k) (West 2010)).

¶ 10           That month, the trial court held a hearing on the State's allegations of respondent parents' unfitness. The various caseworkers testified. Respondent father testified, in relevant part, that he was unable to attend services due to his work schedule. Following evidence and arguments, the court found the State proved all four of its unfitness allegations by clear and convincing evidence.

¶ 11 In May 2012, the trial court held a best-interest hearing. A new caseworker testified that her efforts to contact respondent parents were unsuccessful. She recommended based on her observations that J.S. remain with her foster parents and respondents' parental rights be terminated.

¶ 12 Respondent father testified that he continued to be employed. Respondent mother, who did not attend the meeting because she felt ill, was not working and could stay home to supervise J.S., according to respondent father. He assured the court that J.S. would regularly attend school if returned to respondent parents' care.

¶ 13 The trial court found that termination of respondent parents' parental rights was in J.S.'s best interest and entered an order to that effect.

¶ 14 Respondent mother, in case No. 4-12-0583, and respondent father, in case No. 4-12-0584, appealed. Their appeals have been consolidated for our review.

¶ 15 II. ANALYSIS

¶ 16 On appeal, respondent parents argue the trial court erred in finding them unfit and terminating their parental rights. We disagree.

¶ 17 A trial court's finding of unfitness will be affirmed unless against the manifest weight of the evidence. *In re Adoption of Syck*, 138 Ill. 2d 255, 274, 562 N.E.2d 174, 183 (1990). An unfitness finding supported by any one statutory ground should be affirmed, even if the evidence is insufficient to support other alleged grounds. *In re Jaron Z.*, 348 Ill. App. 3d 239, 259, 810 N.E.2d 108, 124 (2004). Similarly, a trial court's best-interest determination should be affirmed unless against the manifest weight of the evidence. *In re M.F.*, 326 Ill. App. 3d 1110, 1115-16, 762 N.E.2d 701, 706 (2002).

¶ 18 The trial court found respondent parents were unfit in that they failed to maintain a reasonable degree of interest, concern, or responsibility for J.S.'s welfare. See 750 ILCS 50/1(D)(b) (West 2010). That finding was not erroneous. A parent's failure to comply with an imposed service plan is sufficient to support a finding of unfitness due to his or her lack of a reasonable degree of responsibility for the child's welfare. *In re Shauntae P.*, 2012 IL App (1st) 112280, ¶ 90, 967 N.E.2d 968, 987. Here, neither parent completed a single service-plan goal. They failed to maintain contact with their caseworkers. As of the April 2012 unfitness hearing, respondent father had not seen J.S. in more than six months. Respondent mother's visits with J.S. were sporadic and she sometimes attended them intoxicated. Respondent parents showed no interest in becoming fit for J.S.'s return. The court did not err in finding them unfit. As this finding was sufficient, we need not consider the court's remaining unfitness findings.

¶ 19 Moreover, the trial court did not err in finding that termination of respondents' parental rights was in J.S.'s best interest. Termination of parental rights is appropriate when it advances the child's best interest. 705 ILCS 405/2-29(2) (West 2010). J.S.'s placement with her brother and his wife offered a safe and stable home, which the foster parents hoped to make permanent. Her academic performance, which was a concern when she was removed from her parents' custody, showed improvement. In contrast, respondent parents would not have been able to become fit for J.S.'s return home any time in the foreseeable future. Respondent father's demanding work schedule constrained his parenting efforts, as well as his willingness or availability to participate in prescribed services. Respondent mother continued to drink habitually. The court correctly found that termination of respondents' parental rights to allow DCFS to pursue adoption by the foster parents was in J.S.'s best interest.

¶ 20

### III. CONCLUSION

¶ 21

For the foregoing reasons, we affirm the trial court's judgment.

¶ 22

Affirmed.