

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

IN THE MATTER OF THE PARENTAL
RIGHTS AS TO D.G.P.

No. 44445

ADRIANO P. AND LORI L.,
Appellants,

vs.

THE STATE OF NEVADA DIVISION
OF CHILD AND FAMILY SERVICES,
DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN
RESOURCES,
Respondent.

FILED

JUN 16 2005

JANETTE M. BLOOM
CLERK OF SUPREME COURT
BY *J. Richards*
CHIEF DEPUTY CLERK

ORDER OF AFFIRMANCE

This is a proper person appeal from a district court order terminating appellants' parental rights. Eighth Judicial District Court, Family Court Division, Clark County; Gerald W. Hardcastle, Judge.

In order to terminate parental rights, a petitioner must prove by clear and convincing evidence that termination is in the child's best interests and that parental fault exists.¹ If substantial evidence in the record supports the district court's determination that clear and convincing evidence warrants termination, this court will uphold the termination order.² In the present case, the district court determined that it is in the child's best interests that appellants' parental rights be terminated. The district court also found by clear and convincing evidence

¹See Matter of Parental Rights as to D.R.H., 120 Nev. ___, ___, 92 P.3d 1230, 1234 (2004); NRS 128.105.

²Matter of D.R.H., 120 Nev. at ___, 92 P.3d at 1234.

appellants' unfitness, failure of parental adjustment, and only token efforts.

As for unfitness,³ a parent is unfit when by his or her own fault, habit, or conduct toward the child, the parent fails to provide the child with proper care, guidance, and support.⁴ Failure of parental adjustment⁵ occurs when a parent is unable or unwilling, within a reasonable time, to substantially correct the conduct that led to the child being placed outside the home.⁶ Evidence of failure of parental adjustment is established by the parent's failure to comply with the case plan to reunite the family within six months after the child has been placed outside the home.⁷ With respect to token efforts, under NRS 128.105(2)(f), parental fault may be established based on only token efforts to (1) support or communicate with the child, (2) prevent neglect of the child, (3) avoid being an unfit parent, or (4) eliminate the risk of serious physical, mental or emotional harm to the child. Moreover, under NRS 128.109(1)(a) and (2), if a child has lived outside the home for more than fourteen months, it is presumed that the parent has made only token efforts to care for the child and that termination is in the child's best interest.

³NRS 128.105(2)(c).

⁴NRS 128.018.


⁵NRS 128.105(2)(d).


⁶NRS 128.0126.


⁷NRS 128.109(1)(b).

Having reviewed the record, we conclude that substantial evidence supports the district court's conclusion that termination is warranted. Accordingly, we

ORDER the judgment of the district court AFFIRMED.⁸


_____, J.
Rose


_____, J.
Gibbons


_____, J.
Hardesty

cc: Hon. Gerald W. Hardcastle, District Judge, Family Court Division
Attorney General Brian Sandoval/Las Vegas
Lori L.
Adriano P.
Clark County Clerk

⁸Although appellants were not granted leave to file papers in proper person, see NRAP 46(b), we have considered the proper person documents received from them.