

An unpublished opinion of the North Carolina Court of Appeals does not constitute controlling legal authority. Citation is disfavored, but may be permitted in accordance with the provisions of Rule 30(e)(3) of the North Carolina Rules of Appellate Procedure.

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF NORTH CAROLINA

No. COA17-57

Filed: 5 July 2017

Orange County, No. 14JA52-53

IN THE MATTER OF: E.C., A.C.

Appeal by Mother from the Permanency Planning Order and Order for Guardianship (the “Order”) entered on 5 October 2016 by Judge Joseph Moody Buckner in Orange County District Court. Heard in the Court of Appeals 8 June 2017.

*Holcomb & Cabe, LLP, by Carol J. Holcomb, for Petitioner-Appellee.*

*Mercedes O. Chut, P.A., by Mercedes O. Chut, for Respondent-Appellant.*

*Keith Karlsson for Guardian ad Litem.*

DILLON, Judge.

Mother appeals the Order which placed two of her children, E.C. and A.C., in the permanent guardianship of their maternal great aunt and uncle.

Mother argues that there was a lack of evidence to support many of the trial court’s findings concerning Mother’s lack of progress towards reunification with her children. These findings address Mother’s history of drug and alcohol addiction and

IN THE MATTER OF: E.C., A.C.

*Opinion of the Court*

her history of efforts and lack of efforts to deal with the addiction. “This Court's review of a permanency planning order is limited to whether there is competent evidence in the record to support the findings and whether the findings support the conclusions of law.” *In re P.O.*, 207 N.C. App. 35, 41, 698 S.E.2d 525, 530 (2010) (citing *In re Eckard*, 148 N.C. App. 541, 544, 559 S.E.2d 233, 235, *disc. review denied*, 356 N.C. 163, 568 S.E.2d 192 (2002)). We have reviewed the trial court's findings and have considered the arguments of the parties and conclude that the findings of the trial court are supported by the evidence.

Mother further argues that there was no evidence to support the trial court's finding that she lacked fitness as a parent as of the date of the hearing. We conclude that the trial court's findings do support its determination regarding Mother's fitness. For instance, the trial court found that Mother had tested positive four times within five months of the hearing for methadone which had not been prescribed to her and once for alcohol. The trial court found that Mother had not, therefore, recovered from her addiction and that her continued addiction impaired her ability to parent. The trial court found that Mother had not attended all of her individual therapy that she had been ordered to attend, nor had she maintained adequate contact with treatment providers and continued to be unwilling to accept support services. In sum, these and the other findings support the trial court's determination regarding Mother's fitness.

IN THE MATTER OF: E.C., A.C.

*Opinion of the Court*

Finally, Mother argues that the Order is internally inconsistent. We have reviewed the Order and conclude that the Order is clear: it is clear about the placement of the children, the unfitness of Mother, and the unlikelihood that the children could return to Mother's care.

AFFIRMED.

Judges ZACHARY and BERGER concur.

Report per Rule 30(e).