

NOTICE

This order was filed under Supreme Court Rule 23 and may not be cited as precedent by any party except in the limited circumstances allowed under Rule 23(e)(1).

2014 IL App (4th) 4130983-U

NOS. 4-13-0983, 4-13-0984, 4-13-0985, 4-13-0986 cons.

IN THE APPELLATE COURT

OF ILLINOIS

FOURTH DISTRICT

FILED

March 18, 2014
Carla Bender
4th District Appellate
Court, IL

In re: P.P., a Minor,)	Appeal from
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,)	Circuit Court of
Petitioner-Appellee,)	Sangamon County
v. (No. 4-13-0983))	No. 11JA6
LORELEI SWINDLE,)	
Respondent-Appellant.)	
-----)	
In re: P.P., a Minor,)	No. 11JA6
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,)	
Petitioner-Appellee,)	
v. (No. 4-13-0985))	
TYRONE PETTITE,)	
Respondent-Appellant.)	
-----)	
In re: T.P., a Minor,)	No. 11JA7
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,)	
Petitioner-Appellee,)	
v. (No. 4-13-0984))	
LORELEI SWINDLE,)	
Respondent-Appellant.)	
-----)	
In re: T.P., a Minor,)	No. 11JA7
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS,)	
Petitioner-Appellee,)	
v. (No. 4-13-0986))	Honorable
TYRONE PETTITE,)	Steven H. Nardulli,
Respondent-Appellant.)	Judge Presiding.

JUSTICE HOLDER WHITE delivered the judgment of the court.
Justices Pope and Steigmann concurred in the judgment.

ORDER

¶ 1 *Held:* The appellate court affirmed, concluding the trial court's unfitness and best-interests findings were not against the manifest weight of the evidence.

¶ 2 In May 2013, the State filed a motion to terminate the parental rights of respondents, Lorelei Swindle and Tyrone Pettite, as to their minor children, T.P. (born February 23, 2004) and P.P. (born October 17, 2005). Following an October 2013 hearing, the trial court entered a November 2013 order finding both Lorelei and Tyrone unfit. At a best-interests hearing later that month, the court found it was in the minors' best interests that Tyrone's and Lorelei's parental rights be terminated.

¶ 3 Tyrone and Lorelei each appeal, challenging the trial court's unfitness and best interests determinations.

¶ 4 We affirm.

¶ 5 I. BACKGROUND

¶ 6 A. Initial Petitions for Wardship

¶ 7 In December 2009, P.P. and T.P.'s older sibling was indicated for sexual penetration of P.P. and T.P. Thereafter, the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) became involved with the family, sending T.P. and P.P. to live with Tyrone while the older sibling remained in Lorelei's home. During a hand-off staffing in January 2011, a caseworker discovered T.P. and P.P. with the older sibling at Lorelei's home. That month, the State filed petitions for adjudication of wardship of P.P. and T.P., alleging (1) their environment was injurious to their welfare in that they were at substantial risk of sexual abuse as evidenced by sexual abuse perpetrated by their older sibling, and (2) they were neglected in that they were not receiving proper care and supervision based on their parents allowing a sexual-abuse perpetrator to have access to them. The trial court found probable cause to believe the minors were neglected and that an immediate and urgent necessity existed to remove the minors from their home. The court ordered that the minors be placed in a shelter-care facility, granting temporary

custody and guardianship to DCFS. Later that month, the court vacated its shelter-care order and returned custody and guardianship of the minors to Tyrone.

¶ 8 B. Supplemental Petitions for Wardship and Continuance Under Supervision

¶ 9 In September 2011, the State filed supplemental petitions for adjudication of wardship, alleging that P.P. and T.P. were neglected in that their environment was injurious to their welfare based on (1) the presence of illegal drugs in their home while they were present, and (2) illegal drug sales being conducted in their home while they were present. The State's petitions were based on police making three controlled purchases of cocaine at Tyrone's home from Tyrone's adult daughter, who was caring for the minors while Tyrone was in jail.

Following a shelter-care hearing, the trial court found probable cause to believe that P.P. and T.P. were neglected and that an immediate and urgent necessity existed to remove them from Tyrone's home.

¶ 10 In October 2011, after failing to attend court dates in February, June, and August 2011, Lorelei returned to court. The trial court entered an order providing for a minimum of two hours of supervised visitation per week between the minors and each parent. In December 2011, the court ordered that custody and guardianship of the minors be placed with Tyrone, who had been released from jail, and continued the case under supervision. The court required Lorelei and Tyrone to cooperate with all services determined to be in the best interests of the minors and/or the family, including counseling and drug and alcohol treatment. The order left visitation with Lorelei to Tyrone's discretion.

¶ 11 C. Petition To Revoke Continuance Under Supervision

¶ 12 In April 2012, the State filed a petition to revoke the continuance under supervision, asserting Tyrone's March 8, 2012, drug test was positive for cocaine and

tetrahydrocannabinol (THC). The petition also alleged Tyrone failed to comply with "any program of assessment, counseling, treatment, or other services." Tyrone stipulated to the allegations in the petition, and the trial court found the minors to be neglected and placed them in shelter care, granting temporary custody and guardianship to DCFS.

¶ 13 In May 2012, the trial court entered an order of adjudication, finding the minors were neglected due to their environment being injurious to their welfare as evidenced by (1) the presence of illegal drugs in the home while the minors were present and (2) Tyrone failing to comply with random drug testing and later testing positive for cocaine and THC. Following a May 2012 dispositional hearing, the trial court found it was in the minors' best interests to be made wards of the court. The court placed custody and guardianship of the minors with DCFS. In June 2012, the court assigned a court-appointed special advocate (CASA) to the case.

¶ 14 In March 2013, the caseworker filed a permanency report requesting that the permanency goal be changed from "return home" to "substitute care pending court determination on termination of parental rights." In particular, the caseworker noted that Tyrone took two drug tests in November 2012, two drug tests in January 2013, and one drug test in February 2013. In four of the tests, Tyrone's urine tested positive for THC and cocaine, and in one, it tested positive for THC. Tyrone's counselor contacted the caseworker with concerns about the high levels of cocaine in Tyrone's system and, in February 2013, recommended residential drug treatment for Tyrone due to his failure to attend regular groups and his continued drug use. Tyrone refused to begin residential treatment.

¶ 15 The CASA worker's March 2013 report also recommended the goal be changed from "return home" to "substitute care pending court decision," with custody remaining with DCFS. The CASA report explained that neither Tyrone nor Lorelei had fully complied with

their DCFS service plans, and neither parent seemed to be concerned with the minors' increasing behavioral problems at school and their need for treatment regarding the sexual abuse and violence they had witnessed.

¶ 16 D. Motion for Termination of Parental Rights

¶ 17 In May 2013, the State filed a motion for the termination of Lorelei's and Tyrone's parental rights. The State alleged Lorelei was unfit in that she failed to (1) maintain a reasonable degree of interest, concern, or responsibility as to the minors' welfare; (2) make reasonable efforts to correct the conditions which were the basis for the removal of the minors from her; and (3) make reasonable progress toward the return of the minors within nine months after the adjudication of neglect, specifically, from May 3, 2012, to February 3, 2013. With respect to Tyrone, the State alleged he was unfit in that he failed to (1) maintain a reasonable degree of interest, concern, or responsibility as to the minors' welfare; (2) make reasonable efforts to correct the conditions which were the basis for the removal of the minors; and (3) make reasonable progress toward the return of the minors within nine months after the adjudication of neglect, specifically, from May 3, 2012, to February 3, 2013.

¶ 18 In October 2013, a hearing on the State's motion to terminate parental rights commenced.

¶ 19 1. *Pandora Grey's Testimony*

¶ 20 Pandora Grey, a child-welfare specialist at the Family Service Center, testified that she was assigned to T.P. and P.P.'s case in November 2011. Grey gave Lorelei and Tyrone their first service plans in November 2011. Lorelei's plan required that she cooperate with DCFS and the private agency to complete substance-abuse treatment and any requested drug tests, to complete parenting classes, to complete mental-health counseling, to maintain stable housing and

income, and to complete education classes during mental-health counseling regarding sexual abuse of children. Tyrone's service plan required that he maintain stable housing and income and cooperate with DCFS to complete parenting classes, substance-abuse treatment, and any required drug tests. Grey made all necessary referrals for Lorelei and Tyrone. Lorelei did not cooperate with any tasks. Tyrone maintained appropriate housing and stable income and attended visits with the children, but he did not cooperate with parenting classes or substance-abuse treatment.

¶ 21 New service plans were established for November 16, 2011, to April 12, 2012. Both service plans contained the same tasks for Lorelei and Tyrone that their prior service plans contained. Grey did not give the service plan to Lorelei or make any referrals because Lorelei's whereabouts were unknown. Grey provided Tyrone his service plan in January 2012 and spoke with him "[s]everal times" about the tasks he needed to accomplish. Grey made a substance-abuse referral for Tyrone in January 2012, but Tyrone failed to attend, so she made another referral in February 2012. She also submitted a parenting-class referral for Tyrone. During this time, Grey recommended the children be removed from Tyrone's care because he refused to take drug tests on three occasions and then tested positive for cocaine and THC in March and April 2012. Grey stated Tyrone completed parenting classes but she could not remember the time period in which he did so.

¶ 22 After the minors were taken into shelter care in April 2012, new service plans were established, covering the period between April 2012 and September 2012. The parents' service plans required them to complete the same tasks as their prior service plans. Lorelei's whereabouts remained unknown until the May 30, 2012, dispositional hearing, at which point Grey began to have increased contact with Lorelei. On the date of the hearing, Grey gave

Lorelei her service plan and discussed the tasks Lorelei needed to complete. However, Lorelei failed to stay in consistent contact with Grey such that Grey could complete the necessary referrals for services. Lorelei did not cooperate with any task in her service plan. Tyrone maintained stable housing and income and completed parenting classes, but he failed to cooperate with substance-abuse treatment and tested positive for THC twice in May 2012 and once in June 2012.

¶ 23 Lorelei's September 2012 through March 2013 service plan contained the same tasks as her prior service plans, while Tyrone's included all of the same tasks except the parenting classes, which he had completed. During this time period, Lorelei failed to complete parenting classes and child-sexual-abuse education, and she also failed to maintain stable housing or income. "[S]everal months" after Grey made service referrals, Lorelei initiated counseling services and attended a substance-abuse assessment. After the assessment, Lorelei failed to cooperate with substance-abuse treatment. Lorelei's counselor eventually expressed concern to Grey about a conflict of interest in that she was also T.P.'s counselor. The counselor and Grey spoke to Lorelei about contacting another counseling provider, the Mental Health Center, but Lorelei did not do so. According to Grey, Lorelei also failed to complete parenting classes at Parent Place, to which she had been referred. Lorelei told Grey that she completed parenting classes at the Triangle Center, but the documentation Grey received from the Triangle Center did not confirm Lorelei had completed or even engaged in parenting classes. In March 2013, Lorelei obtained housing in Springfield, Illinois; however, Grey described the housing as only suitable for Lorelei, not the children, based on the size. Lorelei also obtained part-time employment.

¶ 24 Lorelei received one hour of supervised visitation with T.P. and P.P. each week. She attended 45 out of 57 available visits. Specifically, in April 2012, Lorelei missed three visits; in May 2012, she missed two visits; in August 2012, she missed four visits; and in September 2012, she missed one visit. According to Grey, when Lorelei missed visits, they were usually "no call/no show," or Lorelei would call within one to two hours prior to the start of the visit, which the agency considered a "no call/no show." Grey knew that Lorelei had Crohn's disease and adjusted visits accordingly but did not make any other adjustments to Lorelei's service plan based on Lorelei's medical condition. Grey also adjusted the time of the visits so that Lorelei could take the bus to the office; however, Grey did not provide Lorelei with bus tokens. Grey observed that, during visits, Lorelei seemed to pay more attention to T.P. than P.P. Grey also testified that she had to address various issues with Lorelei, such as Lorelei speaking repeatedly about demons and devils and talking about the minors' older sibling, who had sexually abused the minors.

¶ 25 According to Grey, Tyrone cooperated with outpatient substance-abuse treatment but refused to complete inpatient substance-abuse treatment, which Gateway Foundation (Gateway) recommended. Tyrone maintained stable housing and had completed parenting classes. He also reported having stable income, although he failed to provide Grey with proof of his income. During this time period, Tyrone cooperated with drug testing at Gateway but tested positive for THC and cocaine once in October 2012, twice in November 2012, twice in January 2013, and once in February 2013. A counselor at Gateway called Grey to express concern about the high levels of cocaine in Tyrone's system. Tyrone attended 64 out of 68 available visits with the minors. Tyrone said he missed one visit due to a car accident and the other visits due to

having to work; however, he did not provide Grey any verification. Like Lorelei, Tyrone seemed to focus more attention on T.P. than P.P.

¶ 26 *2. Tyrone's Testimony*

¶ 27 Tyrone testified that he attempted to stop using cocaine and marijuana during the pendency of the case by going to Gateway three times a week. He said that he was not "putting [his] all into it," explaining that one of the reasons he got turned away from Gateway was because he would arrive late to class. Tyrone refused to attend inpatient treatment because he could not afford to lose his job, where he had been working for eight years.

¶ 28 *3. Lorelei's Testimony*

¶ 29 Lorelei testified that she completed parenting classes, explaining that although she did not complete parenting classes at the Triangle Center, she completed classes at another facility. She also said she attended Narcotics Anonymous and Alcoholics Anonymous at various locations in Springfield, Decatur, and St. Louis. According to Lorelei, she attended a drug assessment at Gateway, and Gateway told her she did not need treatment. She denied that her counselor gave her a referral to another mental-health-counseling facility after her counselor discontinued services based on a conflict of interest. Lorelei stated that she suffered from Crohn's disease, and when her disease was active, she experienced difficulty holding a job and experienced extreme fatigue. She missed the four visits in August because her Crohn's disease resulted in hospitalization. Lorelei obtained a job in January 2013 at Capital Township, where she worked until July 2013.

¶ 30 *E. Unfitness Findings*

¶ 31 In November 2013, the trial court entered an order finding both Lorelei and Tyrone unfit. Specifically, the court found although Lorelei maintained a level of interest and

concern for the children, she failed to (1) maintain a level of responsibility for them, (2) make reasonable efforts to correct the conditions which were the basis for the minors' removal, and (3) make reasonable progress toward the minors' return home during the period between May 3, 2012, and February 3, 2013. The court found Tyrone also maintained a level of interest and concern for the children but failed to (1) make reasonable efforts to correct the conditions which were the basis for the minors' removal and (2) make reasonable progress toward the minors' return during the period between May 3, 2012, and February 3, 2013.

¶ 32

F. Best-Interests Findings

¶ 33

Later that month, a best-interests hearing commenced. Patricia Kaidell, a supervisor of the foster care program at Family Service Center, testified T.P. and P.P. had been in their foster care placement, a specialized relative placement, since April 12, 2012. T.P. and P.P. needed a specialized placement because T.P. demonstrated behavioral issues, such as physical and verbal aggression, and both T.P. and P.P. had a past history of trauma associated with sexual abuse. Kaidell said the minors were making progress in their placement, and their caregiver, Paula H., attended to their educational and social needs by helping with their homework, attending school meetings and conferences, and taking the children to community and family activities. The minors had friends at school and in their neighborhood. Paula indicated she intended to adopt the children and had signed the permanency commitment form. Both P.P. and T.P. were attached to Paula, who was their godmother. By contrast, T.P. and P.P. had a "minimal attachment" to Lorelei, given her inconsistent contact with the minors. Both minors had an attachment to Tyrone, especially T.P. However, Kaidell did not believe T.P. or P.P. would experience harm if Lorelei's and Tyrone's parental rights were terminated because the children had "developed a lifestyle that [did] not include their parents." Kaidell acknowledged

Tyrone could cook for the children, help with schoolwork, ensure they were bathed, and provide for them financially; however, she disagreed that Tyrone could discipline them appropriately, citing an instance in which Tyrone gave T.P. a "high five" for getting in a fight. Kaidell also stated that, in her observations of visits between Lorelei and the minors, Lorelei displayed affection, expressed love for her children, and interacted with them positively. Tyrone testified he had stopped using drugs, attended church, and participated in Narcotics Anonymous/Alcoholics Anonymous group to help maintain his sobriety. Lorelei testified she was not currently employed due to her illness but was in the process of applying for disability. She felt it was important that the children receive a religious education, but she did not know whether one was being provided. The trial court found it was in the minors' best interests that Tyrone's and Lorelei's parental rights be terminated. The court noted that no question existed that Lorelei and Tyrone loved their children. However, Lorelei had "not done a thing" to address the problems that caused the children to be taken into care in the first place. Tyrone's case was "more difficult" because he complied with many of the directives in his service plan. Nonetheless, Tyrone failed to address his drug issues. Although Tyrone testified at the hearing that he was attending meetings twice a day, he failed to take advantage of prior offers for drug treatment. The court found the minors were making progress in their foster mother's care, and they had "a right to move forward."

¶ 34 Lorelei and Tyrone each filed notices of appeal. This court docketed Lorelei's appeals as Nos. 4-13-0983 (Sangamon County case No. 11-JA-6) and 4-13-0984 (Sangamon County case No. 11-JA-7), and Tyrone's appeals as Nos. 4-13-0985 (Sangamon County case No. 11-JA-6) and 4-13-0986 (Sangamon County case No. 11-JA-7). We consolidated the cases on appeal.

¶ 35

II. ANALYSIS

¶ 36 On appeal, Lorelei and Tyrone each challenge the trial court's unfitness and best-interests findings. We address the parties' arguments separately.

¶ 37 A. Lorelei's Claims (Case Nos. 4-13-0983, 4-13-0984)

¶ 38 1. *Unfitness Finding*

¶ 39 Lorelei first asserts the trial court erred by finding her unfit. We disagree.

¶ 40 The State must prove parental unfitness by clear and convincing evidence. *In re A.L.*, 409 Ill. App. 3d 492, 500, 949 N.E.2d 1123, 1129 (2011). We give the trial court's findings great deference because of its superior opportunity to observe the witnesses and evaluate their credibility. *Id.* Accordingly, we will not disturb a trial court's fitness determination unless it is contrary to the manifest weight of the evidence, meaning the opposite conclusion is clearly evident. *Id.*

¶ 41 In this case, the trial court found Lorelei was unfit in that she failed to (1) maintain a level of responsibility for her children (750 ILCS 50/1(D)(b) (West 2012)); (2) make reasonable efforts to correct the conditions that were the basis for the children's removal (750 ILCS 50/1(D)(m)(i) (West 2012)); and (3) make reasonable progress toward the return of the minors during the nine-month period between May 3, 2012, and February 3, 2013 (750 ILCS 50/1(D)(m)(ii) (West 2012)). We may affirm on any one of the grounds on which the trial court found Lorelei unfit. *In re Richard H.*, 376 Ill. App. 3d 162, 165, 875 N.E.2d 1198, 1201 (2007).

¶ 42 "[T]he benchmark for measuring a parent's 'progress toward the return of the child' under section 1(D)(m) of the Adoption Act encompasses the parent's compliance with the service plans and the court's directives, in light of the condition which gave rise to the removal of the child, and in light of other conditions which later become known and which would prevent

the court from returning custody of the child to the parent." *In re C.N.*, 196 Ill. 2d 181, 216-17, 752 N.E.2d 1030, 1050 (2001).

¶ 43 In this case, Lorelei asserts her progress was reasonable in light of the poverty, lack of transportation, medical issues, addiction, and other adversities she faced. We disagree. Pandora Grey testified that, after the May 2012 dispositional hearing, Lorelei failed to stay in consistent contact with her such that Grey was unable to make any necessary service referrals until November 2012. It was not until "several months" later that Lorelei initiated counseling services. By February 2013, Lorelei still had not obtained stable housing. Lorelei also failed to complete parenting classes at the facility to which Grey had referred her, and although Lorelei said she completed parenting classes at another facility, Grey testified the documentation she received from that facility did not confirm Lorelei completed or engaged in those classes. Thus, the record demonstrates Lorelei did not attempt to complete services until approximately six months after the dispositional hearing, and by February 2013, Lorelei still had not completed many objectives in her service plan. Based on the foregoing, the trial court's finding that Lorelei was unfit based on her failure to make reasonable progress toward the return of the minors during the nine-month period between May 3, 2012, and February 3, 2013, was not against the manifest weight of the evidence.

¶ 44 *2. Best-Interests Finding*

¶ 45 Lorelei also asserts the trial court erred by finding it was in T.P. and P.P.'s best interests that her parental rights be terminated.

¶ 46 Following an unfitness finding, "the focus shifts to the child"; thus, at a best-interests hearing, "the parent's interest in maintaining the parent-child relationship must yield to the child's interest in a stable, loving home life." *In re D.T.*, 212 Ill. 2d 347, 364, 818 N.E.2d

1214, 1227 (2004). The State must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it is in the child's best interests that parental rights be terminated. *Id.* at 366, 818 N.E.2d at 1228. We will not reverse a trial court's determination that termination is in the best interests of the child unless it is against the manifest weight of the evidence. *In re T.A.*, 359 Ill. App. 3d 953, 961, 835 N.E.2d 908, 914 (2005).

¶ 47 Here, the evidence established T.P. and P.P. had been in their foster care placement with their godmother, Paula H., since April 2012. According to Kaidell, Paula attended to the minors' needs and the minors, who had a past history of trauma associated with sexual abuse, were making progress in their placement. P.P. and T.P. were attached to Paula, and Paula expressed her desire to adopt the minors. By contrast, T.P. and P.P.'s contact with Lorelei was inconsistent, and according to Kaidell, the minors had a "minimal attachment" to their mother based on this inconsistency. Lorelei also was not yet in a position to parent T.P. and P.P. based on her lack of employment and lack of stable housing. Based on the foregoing, the trial court's determination that it was in T.P. and P.P.'s best interests that Lorelei's parental rights be terminated was not against the manifest weight of the evidence.

¶ 48 Having concluded the trial court did not err by (1) finding Lorelei unfit or (2) determining it was in the minors' best interests that Lorelei's parental rights be terminated, we turn to Tyrone's claims.

¶ 49 B. Tyrone's Claims (Nos. 4-13-0985, 4-13-0986)

¶ 50 On appeal, Tyrone argues the trial court erred by finding that (1) he was an unfit parent and (2) it was in T.P. and P.P.'s best interests that his rights be terminated.

¶ 51 *1. Unfitness Finding*

¶ 52 Tyrone first asserts the trial court erred by finding he was unfit. The State must prove parental unfitness by clear and convincing evidence. *A.L.*, 409 Ill. App. 3d at 500, 949 N.E.2d at 1129. Because the trial court is in a superior position to observe witnesses and evaluate their credibility, we will not disturb a trial court's fitness determination unless it is contrary to the manifest weight of the evidence. *Id.* A decision is against the manifest weight of the evidence when the opposite conclusion is clearly evident. *Id.*

¶ 53 In this case, the trial court found Tyrone was unfit based on his failure to make reasonable (1) efforts to correct the conditions that led to the basis of the children's removal (750 ILCS 50/1(D)(m)(i) (West 2012)), and (2) progress toward the return of the minors within the nine-month period between May 3, 2012, and February 3, 2013, following the adjudication of neglect. 750 ILCS 50/1(D)(m)(ii) (West 2012). We may affirm on any one of the statutory grounds on which the trial court found Tyrone unfit. *Richard H.*, 376 Ill. App. 3d at 165, 875 N.E.2d at 1201.

¶ 54 " 'Reasonable progress' " exists "when the court, based on the evidence before it, can conclude that the progress being made by a parent to comply with directives given for the return of the child is sufficiently demonstrable and of such a quality that the court, in the *near future*, will be able to order the child returned to parental custody" because, "at that point, the parent *will have fully complied* with the directives previously given to the parent in order to regain custody of the child." (Emphases in original.) *In re L.L.S.*, 218 Ill. App. 3d 444, 461, 577 N.E.2d 1375, 1387 (1991). In this case, Tyrone maintained stable housing and income and completed parenting classes. Nonetheless, Tyrone could not overcome his drug addiction, continuing to test positive for THC and cocaine in October 2012, November 2012, January 2013, and February 2013. He refused to attend residential treatment for his substance abuse. Based on

Tyrone's inability to overcome his addiction, he was not any closer to having the minors returned to his care by February 2013 than he was in May 2012. Accordingly, the trial court's determination that Tyrone failed to make reasonable progress was not against the manifest weight of the evidence.

¶ 55

2. Best-Interests Finding

¶ 56 Tyrone also contends the trial court erred by finding it was in P.P. and T.P.'s best interests that his parental rights be terminated. We disagree.

¶ 57 Although the record indicates Tyrone consistently visited with his children and the children were attached to Tyrone, the record also demonstrates Tyrone failed to take advantage of the services offered to him to overcome his substance-abuse issues. On the other hand, Patricia Kaidell, a supervisor of the foster-care program at Family Service Center, testified T.P. and P.P. were attached to their caregiver, Paula H., with whom they had been living since April 2012. Paula wanted to adopt the minors and cared for the minors' needs. As the trial court found, the minors were making progress in their foster mother's care, and they had "a right to move forward."

¶ 58 Based on the foregoing, the trial court's finding that termination of Tyrone's parental rights was in P.P. and T.P.'s best interests is not against the manifest weight of the evidence.

¶ 59

III. CONCLUSION

¶ 60 For the reasons stated, we affirm the trial court's judgment.

¶ 61 Affirmed.