

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**NOT FOR PUBLICATION WITHOUT THE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-3348-16T2
A-3349-16T2

NEW JERSEY DIVISION OF
CHILD PROTECTION AND
PERMANENCY,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

S.J.A., and P.B.G.,

Defendants-Appellants.

IN THE MATTER OF THE GUARDIANSHIP OF
S.T.A.G., Z.L.A., L.V.A., A.P.A.,
L.J.A., J.A., and P.S.A.,

Minors.

Submitted April 10, 2018 – Decided April 18, 2018

Before Judges Fisher and Fasciale.

On appeal from Superior Court of New Jersey,
Chancery Division, Family Part, Gloucester
County, Docket No. FG-08-0053-16.

Joseph E. Krakora, Public Defender, attorney
for appellant S.J.A. (Eric J. Meehan,
Designated Counsel, on the brief).

Joseph E. Krakora, Public Defender, attorney for appellant P.B.G. (Louis W. Skinner, Designated Counsel, on the brief).

Gurbir S. Grewal, Attorney General, attorney for respondent (Melissa H. Raksa, Assistant Attorney General, of counsel; Mary A. Hurley, Deputy Attorney General, on the brief).

Joseph E. Krakora, Public Defender, Law Guardian, attorney for minors P.S.A., S.T.A.G., and Z.L.A. (Noel C. Devlin, Assistant Deputy Public Defender, of counsel and on the brief).

Joseph E. Krakora, Public Defender, Law Guardian, attorney for minors L.V.A. and A.P.A. (Joseph J. Gross, Designated Counsel, on the brief).

Joseph E. Krakora, Public Defender, Law Guardian, attorney for minors L.J.A. and J.A. (Olivia Belfatto Crisp, Assistant Deputy Public Defender, on the brief).

PER CURIAM

Defendants S.J.A. and P.B.G. are the parents of seven children who were born in 2005, 2006, 2008, 2011, 2012, 2013 and 2016. Judge Timothy W. Chell presided over a two-day guardianship trial, after which he found that the evidence warranted termination of both defendants' parental rights to all but the oldest child. Both defendants appeal, arguing the judge erred in finding clear and convincing evidence on any of the four prongs of the applicable statutory test, N.J.S.A. 30:4C-15.1; defendant P.B.G. also argues

he "should not be penalized for the actions of S.J.A."¹ We find insufficient merit in these arguments, R. 2:11-3(e)(1)(E), and affirm substantially for the reasons set forth by Judge Chell in his thorough and well-reasoned written decision.

Affirmed.

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



CLERK OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION

¹ All the children but two — the two youngest, L.J.A. and J.A. — support defendants' arguments.