

An unpublished opinion of the North Carolina Court of Appeals does not constitute controlling legal authority.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. COA23-587

Filed 19 December 2023

Alamance County, No. 21 JT 101

IN THE MATTER OF: K.R.C.

Appeal by respondent from order entered 10 March 2023 by Judge Kathryn Whitaker Overby in Alamance County District Court. Heard in the Court of Appeals 20 November 2023.

Jamie L. Hamlett, for petitioner Alamance County Department of Social Services.

Hartzog Law Group, LLP, by Katherine Barber-Jones, for guardian ad litem.

Jeffrey William Gillette for respondent-father.

PER CURIAM.

Father has filed a no-merit brief pursuant to N.C.R. App. P. 3.1(d), asking this Court to conduct an independent review of the record to determine whether the trial court erred when it terminated his parental rights to his son, K.R.C. (“Kevin”).¹ Counsel has provided Father with copies of all relevant documents and has advised

¹ A pseudonym has been used throughout the opinion to protect the identity of the juvenile and for ease of reading. See N.C. R. App. P. 42(b)(1).

him that he may file his own argument. Father has not filed his own written arguments.

We have reviewed the record and conclude that the trial court did not err when it terminated Father's parental rights to Kevin. It appears the trial court exercised proper jurisdiction over the matter. And Father concedes that there was competent evidence to support the trial court's conclusion that grounds existed to terminate his parental rights based on the grounds of N.C. Gen. Stat. § 7B-1111(a)(3), and only one ground is necessary to support a termination order. *In re J.D.O.*, 381 N.C. 799, 805, 874 S.E.2d 507, 514 (2022) (recognizing that "an adjudication of any single ground for terminating a parent's rights under N.C.G.S. § 7B-1111(a) will suffice to support a termination order."). Finally, the trial court did not abuse its discretion when it determined that terminating Father's parental rights was in Kevin's best interests, as the evidence showed that Kevin was bonded with his foster parents, had favorable prospects of being adopted by them, and needed a permanent, stable home. *In re E.S.*, 378 N.C. 8, 12, 859 S.E.2d 185, 188 (2021) (stating that an abuse of discretion occurs only where "the court's ruling is manifestly unsupported by reason or is so arbitrary that it could not have been the result of a reasoned decision.").

AFFIRMED.

Panel consisting of Judges DILLON, MURPHY, and GORE.

Report per Rule 30(e).