

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF IOWA**

No. 9-1072 / 09-1489  
Filed February 10, 2010

**IN THE INTEREST OF S.V.,  
Minor Child,**

**G.L., Father,  
Appellant.**

---

Appeal from the Iowa District Court for Monroe County, William S. Owens,  
Associate Juvenile Judge.

A father appeals a juvenile court order terminating his parental rights to his  
minor child. **AFFIRMED.**

Kevin S. Maughan of Maughan Law Office, Albia, for appellant.

Thomas J. Miller, Attorney General, Kathrine S. Miller-Todd, Assistant  
Attorney General, and Steven E. Goodlow, County Attorney, for appellee.

Ryan Mitchell, Ottumwa, for mother.

Jonathan Willier, Centerville, attorney and guardian ad litem for minor  
child.

Considered by Eisenhauer, P.J., and Potterfield, J., and Huitink, S.J.\*

\*Senior judge assigned by order pursuant to Iowa Code section 602.9206 (2009).

**HUITINK, S.J.**

Gonzalo and Laura are the parents of Samantha, who was born in 2002. Gonzalo has been in prison in Texas since 2002 for the sexual assault of Laura. He is a registered sex offender. Gonzalo could be released as soon as 2010, although he may remain in prison until 2014. He has had little to no contact with the child throughout her life, and does not have a relationship with her.

The juvenile court terminated Gonzalo's parental rights under Iowa Code sections 232.116(1)(b) (2009) (abandonment), (f) (child four or older, CINA, removed for at least twelve months, and cannot safely be returned home), and (j) (child CINA, parent imprisoned and unlikely to be released for five or more years).<sup>1</sup> The court found termination of Gonzalo's parental rights was in the child's best interests. Gonzalo appeals the termination of his parental rights.

The scope of review in termination cases is *de novo*. *In re R.E.K.F.*, 698 N.W.2d 147, 149 (Iowa 2005). Clear and convincing evidence is needed to establish the grounds for termination. *In re T.P.*, 757 N.W.2d 267, 269 (Iowa Ct. App. 2008). Our primary concern in termination cases is the best interests of the child. *In re A.S.*, 743 N.W.2d 865, 867 (Iowa Ct. App. 2007).

Gonzalo contends he was not provided with any services designed to reunite him with his child. There is a requirement that reasonable services should be offered to preserve the family unit. *In re H.L.B.R.*, 567 N.W.2d 675, 679 (Iowa Ct. App. 1997). It is the parent's responsibility, however, to demand services if they are not offered prior to the termination hearing. *Id.* There is no

---

<sup>1</sup> CINA stands for a child who has been adjudicated by the juvenile court to be a Child In Need of Assistance under section 232.2(6).

evidence Gonzalo requested any services prior to the termination hearing. We conclude he has not preserved this issue for our review.

Gonzalo also contends there was not sufficient evidence in the record to support termination of his parental rights under section 232.116(1)(j). In addition to section 232.116(1)(j), Gonzalo's parental rights were terminated under sections 232.116(1)(b) and (f). "When the juvenile court terminates parental rights on more than one statutory ground, we need only find grounds to terminate under one of the sections cited by the juvenile court to affirm." *In re S.R.*, 600 N.W.2d 63, 64 (Iowa Ct. App. 1999). Because Gonzalo has not challenged the termination of his parental rights under sections 232.116(1)(b) and (f) we may affirm on these grounds. See Iowa R. App. P. 6.903(2)(g)(3) (2009) ("Failure to cite authority in support of an issue may be deemed waiver of that issue.").

We affirm the juvenile court decision terminating the father's parental rights.

**AFFIRMED.**