

RECORD IMPOUNDED

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION WITHOUT THE
APPROVAL OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION**

This opinion shall not "constitute precedent or be binding upon any court."
Although it is posted on the internet, this opinion is binding only on the
parties in the case and its use in other cases is limited. R. 1:36-3.

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY
APPELLATE DIVISION
DOCKET NO. A-5188-15T1

NEW JERSEY DIVISION OF
CHILD PROTECTION AND
PERMANENCY,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

C.T.,

Defendant-Appellant.

IN THE MATTER OF E.H.,

A minor.

Submitted September 26, 2017 — Decided October 24, 2017

Before Judges Sumners and Moynihan.

On appeal from Superior Court of New Jersey,
Chancery Division, Family Part, Bergen County,
Docket No. FN-02-0277-15.

Joseph E. Krakora, Public Defender, attorney
for appellant (Robert W. Ratish, Designated
counsel, on the brief).

Christopher S. Porrino, Attorney General,
attorney for respondent (Andrea M. Silkowitz,
Assistant Attorney General, of counsel; Mehnaz
Rahim, Deputy Attorney General, on the brief).

Joseph E. Krakora, Public Defender, attorney
for minor (Noel C. Devlin, Assistant Deputy
Public Defender, of counsel and on the brief).

PER CURIAM

The Division of Child Protection and Permanency filed this action charging defendant with emotional abuse and neglect of her then twelve-year-old daughter E.H., as a result of defendant's alcohol abuse, threat to attempt suicide while E.H. was present, and inappropriate parenting behavior. Following a fact-finding hearing, Judge Jane Gallina-Mecca issued an order on March 10, 2016, determining that defendant's conduct constituted abuse and neglect under N.J.S.A. 9:6-8.21(c)(4)(b).


On appeal, defendant argues the judge failed to consider evidence of E.H.'s behavioral issues and defendant's mental illness. Defendant also contends the judge erred in relying on contested testimony and did not consider the reasons defendant terminated E.H.'s relationship with defendant's allegedly abusive ex-boyfriend, who was a father figure to E.H. We find insufficient merit in these arguments to warrant discussion in a written opinion. R. 2:11-3(e)(1)(E).

We affirm substantially for the reasons stated by Judge Gallina-Mecca in her thorough, well-reasoned oral decision covering sixty transcript pages. Her findings were based on

substantial evidence she found credible and, for that reason, we must defer to those findings. Cesare v. Cesare, 154 N.J. 394, 411-13 (1974); N.J. Div. of Youth & Family Servs. v. H.B., 375 N.J. Super. 148, 172 (App. Div. 2005). Finding no principled reason for second-guessing the judge's findings or the conclusions drawn from those findings, we reject defendant's arguments.

Affirmed.

I hereby certify that the foregoing
is a true copy of the original on
file in my office.


CLERK OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION