

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**NOT FOR PUBLICATION WITHOUT THE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-1035-17T2

NEW JERSEY DIVISION OF
CHILD PROTECTION AND
PERMANENCY,

Plaintiff-Respondent,

v.

A.E.M.,

Defendant,

and

L.L.,

Defendant-Appellant.

IN THE MATTER OF S.L., A Minor.

Submitted December 19, 2018 – Decided January 4, 2019

Before Judges Nugent and Reisner.

On appeal from Superior Court of New Jersey,
Chancery Division, Family Part, Hudson County,
Docket No. FN-09-0141-16.

Joseph E. Krakora, Public Defender, attorney for appellant (Durrell Wachtler Ciccia, Designated Counsel, on the brief).

Gurbir S. Grewal, Attorney General, attorney for respondent (Mohamed Barry, Deputy Attorney General, on the brief).

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

PER CURIAM

L.L. appeals from an order terminating litigation in this Title 30 and Title 9 action.¹ Specifically, L.L. challenges the January 19, 2017 post fact finding order that L.L. abused or neglected his seven-year-old child. Judge Lois Lipton determined that plaintiff, the New Jersey Division of Child Protection and Permanency, had proved that by driving while under the influence of alcohol while his child was unrestrained in the vehicle's rear seat, defendant placed the child in imminent danger, thereby abusing or neglecting him.

On appeal, defendant argues:

The Trial Court Incorrectly Applied the Legal Principles Governing Abuse and Neglect Matters to the

¹ Defendant, A.E.M., has not appealed. For ease of reference we thus refer to L.L. as "defendant."

Facts. The Record Falls Short of Satisfying Those Standards and Therefore Abuse and Neglect of [L.L.] Should Not Be Affirmed.

We affirm, substantially for the reasons expressed by Judge Lipton in her oral decision. Her adjudication is based on findings of fact which are adequately supported by the evidence. R. 2:11-3(e)(1)(A). Defendant's arguments are without sufficient merit to warrant discussion in a written opinion. R. 2:11-3(e)(1)(E).

Affirmed.

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



CLERK OF THE APPELLATE DIVISION