

\*\*\*\*\*

The “officially released” date that appears near the beginning of each opinion is the date the opinion will be published in the Connecticut Law Journal or the date it was released as a slip opinion. The operative date for the beginning of all time periods for filing postopinion motions and petitions for certification is the “officially released” date appearing in the opinion. In no event will any such motions be accepted before the “officially released” date.

All opinions are subject to modification and technical correction prior to official publication in the Connecticut Reports and Connecticut Appellate Reports. In the event of discrepancies between the electronic version of an opinion and the print version appearing in the Connecticut Law Journal and subsequently in the Connecticut Reports or Connecticut Appellate Reports, the latest print version is to be considered authoritative.

The syllabus and procedural history accompanying the opinion as it appears on the Commission on Official Legal Publications Electronic Bulletin Board Service and in the Connecticut Law Journal and bound volumes of official reports are copyrighted by the Secretary of the State, State of Connecticut, and may not be reproduced and distributed without the express written permission of the Commission on Official Legal Publications, Judicial Branch, State of Connecticut.

\*\*\*\*\*

IN RE DANIEL L. ET AL.\*  
(AC 30084)

Bishop, Alvord and Borden, Js.

Argued March 15—officially released April 13, 2010

(Appeal from Superior Court, judicial district of New Haven, Juvenile Matters, Conway, J.)

*David B. Rozwaski*, for the appellant (respondent father).

*Colleen B. Valentine*, assistant attorney general, with whom, on the brief, were *Richard Blumenthal*, attorney general, and *Susan T. Pearlman*, assistant attorney general, for the appellee (petitioner).

*Opinion*

PER CURIAM. The respondent, the father of two minor children, Daniel L. and Diamond L., appeals from the judgments of the trial court terminating his parental rights as to the children.<sup>1</sup> In substance, he claims that two of the court's critical findings are clearly erroneous. Those two findings are that (1) he failed to achieve such a degree of personal rehabilitation as would encourage the belief that within a reasonable time, considering the ages and needs of the children, he could assume a responsible position in their lives, and (2) the termination of his parental rights was in the children's best interests. See General Statutes § 17a-112 (j) (2) and (3) (B). We affirm the judgments of the trial court.

Our scope of review of such findings is well settled. Such findings must stand unless they are clearly erroneous. *In re Shaun B.*, 97 Conn. App. 203, 209–10, 903 A.2d 246 (2006) (finding of lack of rehabilitation); *In re Tyscheicka H.*, 61 Conn. App. 19, 26–27, 762 A.2d 916 (2000) (finding that termination in best interest of child). The court found that the petitioner, the commissioner of children and families, had established both factors by clear and convincing evidence. We have considered the thorough and well reasoned decision of the court in light of the claims of the respondent, as well as the entire record, and conclude that there was abundant evidence to support the critical factual determinations of the court.

**The judgments are affirmed.**

\* In accordance with the spirit and intent of General Statutes § 46b-142 (b) and Practice Book § 79-3, the names of the parties involved in this appeal are not disclosed. The records and papers of this case shall be open for inspection only to persons having a proper interest therein and upon order of the Appellate Court.

<sup>1</sup> The court also terminated the parental rights of the children's mother. Because she has not appealed, we refer in this opinion to the respondent father as the respondent.

---