

**STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA  
SUPREME COURT OF APPEALS**

**In Re: B.B.:**

**No. 11-0050** (Mingo County No. 10-JA-35)

**FILED**

**June 17, 2011**

RORY L. PERRY II, CLERK  
SUPREME COURT OF APPEALS  
OF WEST VIRGINIA

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

This appeal arises from the Circuit Court of Mingo County, wherein the Petitioner Father's parental rights to B.B. were terminated. The appeal was timely perfected by counsel, with the petitioner's appendix accompanying the petition. The West Virginia Department of Health and Human Resources ("DHHR") has filed its response. The guardian ad litem has filed her response on behalf of the child, B.B. The Court has carefully reviewed the record provided and the written arguments of the parties, and the case is mature for consideration.

Having reviewed the record and the relevant decision of the circuit court, the Court is of the opinion that the decisional process would not be significantly aided by oral argument. Upon consideration of the standard of review and the record presented, the Court determines that there is no prejudicial error. This case does not present a new or significant question of law. For these reasons, a memorandum decision is appropriate under Rule 21 of the Revised Rules of Appellate Procedure.

"Although conclusions of law reached by a circuit court are subject to *de novo* review, when an action, such as an abuse and neglect case, is tried upon the facts without a jury, the circuit court shall make a determination based upon the evidence and shall make findings of fact and conclusions of law as to whether such child is abused or neglected. These findings shall not be set aside by a reviewing court unless clearly erroneous. A finding is clearly erroneous when, although there is evidence to support the finding, the reviewing court on the entire evidence is left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed. However, a reviewing court may not overturn a finding simply because it would have decided the case differently, and it must affirm a finding if the circuit court's account of the evidence is plausible in light of the record viewed in its entirety." Syl. Pt. 1, *In the Interest of: Tiffany Marie S.*, 196 W.Va. 223, 470 S.E.2d 177 (1996). The petitioner challenges the circuit court's order terminating his parental rights, arguing that the circuit court erred in relying on his history of abuse and neglect proceedings, and in relying on his status as a registered sex offender. Aggravated circumstances as to the Petitioner Father exist, as he previously had his parental rights to four other children terminated in three other abuse and neglect proceedings. "When an abuse and neglect petition is brought based solely

upon a previous involuntary termination of parental rights to a sibling pursuant to West Virginia Code § 49-6-5b(a)(3) (1998), prior to the lower court's making any disposition regarding the petition, it must allow the development of evidence surrounding the prior involuntary termination(s) and what actions, if any, the parent(s) have taken to remedy the circumstances which led to the prior termination(s)." Syl. Pt. 4, *In the Matter of George Glen B., Jr.*, 205 W.Va. 435, 518 S.E.2d 863 (1999). "Although the requirement that such a petition be filed does not mandate termination in all circumstances, the legislature has reduced the minimum threshold of evidence necessary for termination where one of the factors outlined in West Virginia Code § 49-6-5b(a) (1998) is present." Syl. Pt. 2, in part, *In Re George Glen B.*, 205 W.Va. 435, 518 S.E.2d 863 (1999).

In this matter, the circuit court ordered the DHHR to provide petitioner with services, including a psychological evaluation, supervised visitation, and drug screens, despite extensive services having been provided during the three prior abuse and neglect proceedings. The circuit court terminated petitioner's parental rights because he has failed to improve his circumstances since the prior abuse and neglect proceedings and petitioner also has failed to acknowledge fault as to the circumstances that led to removal. The circuit court further relied on petitioner's status as a sexual offender, and the aggravated circumstances from the previous matters in reaching this decision. Accordingly, the circuit court found it to be in the child's best interest to terminate the petitioner's parental rights. The Court finds that this decision was within the circuit court's discretion and concludes that there was no error in relation to the termination of parental rights.

For the foregoing reasons, we find no error in the decision of the circuit court to terminate petitioner's parental rights and the circuit court's order is hereby affirmed.

Affirmed.

**ISSUED:** June 17, 2011

**CONCURRED IN BY:**

Chief Justice Margaret L. Workman  
Justice Robin Jean Davis  
Justice Brent D. Benjamin  
Justice Menis E. Ketchum  
Justice Thomas E. McHugh