

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA

No. 6-651 / 06-0938
Filed August 23, 2006

**IN THE INTEREST OF D.B.,
Minor Child,**

D.B., Father,
Appellant.

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Polk County, Gregory D. Brandt,
District Associate Judge.

Father appeals from juvenile court permanency order. **AFFIRMED.**

Jesse A. Macro, Jr., Des Moines, for appellant father.

Alexandra Nelissen of Nelissen & Juckette, P.C., Des Moines, for mother.

Thomas J. Miller, Attorney General, Bruce Kempkes, Assistant Attorney
General, John Sarcone, County Attorney, and Jon Anderson, Assistant County
Attorney, for appellee State.

Nancy Pietz, Des Moines, for minor child.

Considered by Huitink, P.J., and Mahan and Zimmer, JJ.

HUITINK, P.J.

Donald, the father of D.B., appeals from a juvenile court permanency order pursuant to Iowa Code section 232.104(2)(b) (2005), continuing placement of D.B. in the custody of the Iowa Department of Human Services (DHS) for an additional six months. Donald argues the juvenile court erred in (1) failing to grant him visitation and allowing DHS full responsibility for determining all visitation and (2) admitting irrelevant exhibits into evidence. Our review is de novo. *In re K.C.*, 660 N.W.2d 29, 32 (Iowa 2003).

Donald left the courtroom in the middle of the permanency hearing. After his departure, his counsel indicated to the court Donald's "goal for permanency was to have a nuclear family unit, that being a wife, mother, a child, family unit as it was at one point in their lives." Counsel expressed no position "in regards to any of the specific recommendations" for permanency. Donald's failure to raise the issue of visitation at the permanency hearing leaves us nothing to review on appeal. *See Meier v. Senecaut*, 641 N.W.2d 532, 537 (Iowa 2002) ("It is a fundamental doctrine of appellate review that issues must ordinarily be both raised and decided by the district court before we will decide them on appeal."). Similarly, Donald's failure to make a specific objection to the admission of exhibits into evidence at the hearing leaves us nothing to review. *See Roberts v. Newville*, 554 N.W.2d 298, 300 (Iowa Ct. App. 1996) ("A timely and specific objection is required to alert the judge to the issue raised and enable opposing counsel to take corrective action to remedy the defect if possible.").

AFFIRMED.