

APPELLATE CASE LAW UPDATE

**Significant Decisions in Juvenile Court Cases,
August 2009 – August 2010**

Presented by the Honorable Michael C. Livingston

Table of Contents

SECTION I

Dependency Cases – pages 1-27

1. *Dept. of Human Services v. C.Z.*, --- Or App ---, --- P3d --- (July 28, 2010) (state failed to prove that mother’s use of marijuana on one occasion, out of the home and out of the presence of the children, was sufficient to support juvenile court jurisdiction under ORS 419B.100(1)(c))
2. *Dept. of Human Services v. M.J.*, --- Or App ---, --- P3d --- (July 28, 2010) (because child is a “refugee child,” as defined by ORS 418.935, juvenile court erred in failing to apply the Refugee Child Welfare Act, ORS 418.925 - 418.945)
3. *Department of Human Services v. F. W.*, 234 Or App 365, 228 P3d 736, rev allowed, --- Or ---, --- P3d --- (July 8, 2010) (allowing review in permanency proceeding to decide, among other things, whether “the ultimate responsibility to determine which permanent plan should be chosen for the child lie[s] with the juvenile court or with the Department of Human Services” and whether “a determination about whether it is in the child’s best interest to terminate parental rights [is] a consideration at the permanency hearing, or must * * * await the termination trial”)
4. *Dept. of Human Services v. B.J.W.*, 235 Or App 307, 230 P3d 965 (2010) (construing and applying ORS 419B.325 – *i.e.*, “[evidence] relating to the ward’s mental, physical and social history and prognosis”)
5. *Dept. of Human Services v. L.P.H.*, 235 Or App 69, --- P3d --- (2010) (reversing permanency judgment changing permanent plan from reunification to adoption because the judgment failed to include a determination, or finding, required by ORS 419B.476(5)(d) that “none of the circumstances enumerated in ORS 419B.498(2) is applicable”)
6. *Dept. of Human Services v. K.L.R.*, 235 Or App 1, 230 P3d 49 (2010) (holding that: (1) requiring an admission of abuse as a condition of reunification violates a parent’s Fifth Amendment rights; (2) terminating parental rights based on parent’s failure to comply with a juvenile court order to engage in meaningful therapy, perhaps in part because the parent’s failure to acknowledge abuse prohibits meaningful therapy, does *not* violate the parent’s Fifth Amendment rights; and (3) granting “use” immunity from criminal prosecution is a necessary condition to compelling potentially incriminating statements as an inducement for full cooperation and disclosure in juvenile court dependency proceedings)

7. **Dept. of Human Services v. G.G., 234 Or App 652, 229 P3d 621 (2009)** (applying UCCJEA provision -- ORS 109.731 -- which requires that communications between Oregon court and court in another state concerning transfer of jurisdiction be disclosed to the parties)
8. **State v. L.C., 234 Or App 347, 228 P3d 594 (2009)** (reversing permanency judgment changing permanent plan from APPLA to adoption because the record showed that it was improbable that a suitable adoptive placement would be found)
9. **Dept. Of Human Services v. G.E., 233 Or App 618, 227 P3d 1180 (2010)** (reversing permanency judgment because judgment did not include findings required by ORS 419B.476(5)(d))
10. **State v. J.G., 233 Or App 616, 227 P3d 1181 (2010)** (accepting state's concession that, under ORS 419B.100(1)(c), an allegation that father had history of assaultive behavior, without more, is insufficient to establish a basis for jurisdiction)
11. **State v. M.A.H., 233 Or App 467, 226 P3d 59 (2010)** (dismissing appeal because question raised by DHS on appeal – *i.e.*, whether an adoptive resource must be identified before a permanency plan can be changed from reunification to adoption – had become moot)
12. **State ex rel Juv. Dept. v. N.W., 232 Or App 101, 221 P3d 174 (2009), rev den, 348 Or 291 (2010)** (taken together, allegations that mother used controlled substances and repeatedly allowed her children to come into contact with untreated sex offenders, if proven, are sufficient to establish dependency jurisdiction)
13. **State v. A.L.M., 232 Or App 13, 220 P3d 449 (2009)** (juvenile court erred in continuing wardship, where there was no evidence that, at the time of the permanency hearing, child's conditions and circumstances presented a reasonable likelihood of harm to the child)
14. **State ex rel Dept. of Human Services v. D.T.C., 231 Or App 545, 219 P3d 610 (2009)** (state failed to prove that father's use of alcohol and his failure to follow through with recommended treatment endangered his children's welfare)
15. **State v. S.M.P., 230 Or App 750, 217 P3d 260 (2009)** (where the state proved by a preponderance of the evidence that child had been physically abused, juvenile court erred in dismissing the dependency petition, notwithstanding that the state did not prove causation or that mother was responsible for the abuse)

16. *State ex rel Dept. of Human Services v. T.N.*, 230 Or App 575, 216 P3d 341 (2009) (reversing permanency judgments because defects in the judgments precluded appellate review)

17. *State ex rel Juv. Dept. v. S.A.*, 230 Or App 346, 214 P3d 851 (2009) (allegation that the father “has a history of substance abuse, which if active, would endanger the welfare of the child” does not state a ground for dependency jurisdiction under ORS 419B.100)

18. *State ex rel Juv. Dept. v. J. F. B.*, 230 Or App 106, 214 P3d 827 (2009) (reversing permanency judgment because of inadequate findings)

19. *State ex rel Department of Human Services v. E. K.*, 230 Or App 63, 214 P3d 58, rev den 347 Or 348 (2009) (affirming permanency judgments changing case plans for four of the mother’s six children where, notwithstanding reasonable efforts by DHS and the mother’s access to community resources, the mother’s deficiencies continue to prevent her from being able to adequately supervise her children or meet their psychological and emotional needs)

SECTION II

Delinquency Cases -- pages 27-32

20. *State ex rel Juvenile Department of Douglas County, Respondent, v. K. C. W. R.*, 235 Or App 315, 230 P3d 973 (2010) (construing and applying ORS 163.165(1)(e) – *i.e.*, assault “[w]hile being aided by another person actually present”)

21. *Smith v. Jester*, 234 Or App 631, 228 P3d 1232 (2010) (a youth seeking post-adjudication relief in a juvenile delinquency case must do so by filing a petition under ORS 419C.615 in the juvenile court in the county where the delinquency petition was adjudicated; the Post-Adjudication Relief Act, ORS 138.510 to 138.680, does not apply to juvenile court delinquency adjudications)

22. *State ex rel Juv. Dept. v. L.A.W.*, 233 Or App 456, 226 P3d 60 (2010) (a determination whether a youth’s waiver of rights following *Miranda* warnings is valid must be based on the totality of the circumstances that exist in a particular case)

23. *State ex rel Juv. Dept. v. K.I.S.*, 232 Or App 559, 222 P3d 750 (December 16, 2009) (juvenile court erred in committing youth to the custody of the Oregon Youth Authority (OYA) for placement in a youth correctional facility without making a finding that it is in youth's best interests to be placed in OYA custody)

24. *State ex rel Juv. Dept. v. S.P.*, 346 Or 592, 215 P3d 847 (2009) (victim’s statements to CARES staff were “testimonial” and, as such, were not admissible under the Confrontation Clause because, although the victim was unavailable as a witness, youth had no prior opportunity to cross-examine)

SECTION III

Termination-of-Parental-Rights Cases -- pages 32-39

25. *Dept. of Human Services v. J.L.J.*, 233 Or App 544, 226 P3d 112 (2010) (child's reunification with father, who previously had relinquished his parental rights to the child, did not constitute "extraordinary circumstances" required to authorize juvenile court to vacate judgment terminating mother's parental rights)

26. *State ex rel Dept. of Human Services v. B.A.S./J.S.*, 232 Or App 245, 221 P3d 806 (2009), rev den, 348 Or 280 (2010) (application of ORS 419B.923(3), which precludes juvenile court from setting aside termination judgment if the adoption proceeding is pending or completed, does not violate the parents' Due Process rights)

27. *State ex rel Dept. of Human Services v. L.S.*, 232 Or App 1, 220 P3d 457 (2009) (although mother's health issues and history with DHS are of some concern, given the significant improvements in mother's health, DHS failed to prove by clear and convincing evidence that, at the time of trial, she was unfit for purposes of ORS 419B.504)

28. *State ex rel Juv. Dept. v. S.W.*, 231 Or App 311, 218 P3d 558, rev den, 347 Or 446 (2009) (juvenile court did not err in terminating mother's parental rights, because the state proved that mother's mental health problems rendered her presently unfit, she would require at least another year of DBT therapy, that therapy would not resolve all of her problems, DHS's efforts were reasonable, and termination was in the child's best interests)

29. *State ex rel Dept. of Human Services v. A.C.*, 230 Or App 119, 213 P3d 844 (2009) (adhering to earlier decision affirming juvenile court's denial of petition seeking termination of parental rights based on "extreme conduct" under ORS 419B.502)

SECTION IV

Decisions of Continuing Significance -- pages 40-45

30. *State v. McCants/Walker*, 231 Or App 570, 220 P3d 436 (2009), rev allowed 348 Or 114 (2010) (sufficiency of evidence to prove criminal mistreatment)

31. *State ex rel Juv. Dept. v. G. L.*, 220 Or App 216, 185 P3d 483, rev den, 345 Or 158 (2008) (juvenile court's authority to order psychological evaluations)

32. *G.A.C. v. State ex rel Juv. Dept.*, 219 Or App 1, 182 P3d 223 (2008) (reversing judgments dismissing petitions alleging physical abuse)