

COURT OF APPEALS OF OHIO, EIGHTH APPELLATE DISTRICT,
CUYAHOGA COUNTY

In re Y.G., et al.

In re Y.G., 2026-Ohio-267 (8th Dist. 2026) · No. No. 115538 · Decided January 29, 2026

SUMMARY

The Eighth District Court of Appeals of Ohio affirmed juvenile court orders concerning six minor children, including permanent custody to Cuyahoga County Children and Family Services, legal custody to caregivers, and placement of one child in a planned permanent-living arrangement. The court held that the juvenile court’s findings under Ohio Revised Code Chapter 2151 and its best-interest determinations were supported by the manifest weight of the evidence. The court also addressed the parent’s fundamental liberty interest in the care and custody of her children and the applicable clear-and-convincing-evidence standard.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals of Ohio, Eighth Appellate District, Cuyahoga County
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Eileen T. Gallagher, P.J.; Michael John Ryan, J.; Eileen A. Gallagher, J.
JURISDICTION	Court of Appeals of Ohio, Eighth Appellate District, Cuyahoga County
DECIDED	January 29, 2026
DOCKET	No. 115538
DISPOSITION	affirmed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Mother appealed six juvenile-court judgments awarding permanent custody of three children to CCDCFS, legal custody of two children to separate caregivers, and placement of one child in a planned permanent living arrangement.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Permanent-custody determinations are reviewed under the sufficiency-of-the-evidence and manifest-weight-of-the-evidence standards, as appropriate to the arguments presented. Under manifest-weight review, the appellate court weighs the evidence and reasonable inferences, considers witness credibility, and determines whether the factfinder clearly lost its way and created a manifest miscarriage of justice.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	Published Ohio appellate opinion; precedential within the applicable jurisdiction.

PARTIES

Mother v. Cuyahoga County Division of Children and Family Services (CCDCFS)

TOPICS

termination of parental rights

child custody

parental rights

standard of review

appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

family law

juvenile law

child welfare

parental rights

appellate procedure

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether the juvenile court's finding that the statutory grounds for permanent custody existed was against the manifest weight of the evidence.
2. Whether permanent custody of A.G., Jayc.G., and Jayv.G. was in the children's best interests under R.C. 2151.414(D).
3. Whether placement of Y.G. in a planned permanent living arrangement was supported by the statutory requirements and the manifest weight of the evidence.
4. Whether placement of T.G. and L.G. in the legal custody of their respective caregivers was in their best interests.

HOLDINGS

1. The juvenile court's findings under R.C. 2151.414(B)(1)(a) and (B)(1)(d) were supported by the evidence and satisfied the first prong of the permanent-custody analysis.
2. Permanent custody of A.G., Jayc.G., and Jayv.G. was in their best interests, and the juvenile court's determination was not against the manifest weight of the evidence.
3. The juvenile court properly placed Y.G. in a planned permanent living arrangement because she was at least sixteen, had developmental disabilities, and the PPLA was supported by clear and convincing evidence as being in her best interests.
4. The juvenile court properly granted legal custody of T.G. and L.G. to their respective caregivers because the dispositions were supported by a preponderance of the evidence and were in the children's best interests.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“When reviewing for manifest weight, the appellate court must weigh the evidence and all reasonable inferences, consider the credibility of the witnesses, and determine whether, in resolving conflicts in the evidence, the finder of fact clearly lost its way and created such a manifest miscarriage of justice that the judgment must be reversed and a new trial ordered.” (II.A)

“Legal custody is meant to be permanent in nature. However, it differs from a termination of parental rights in that the parent who loses legal custody of a child “retains residual parental rights, privileges and

| *responsibilities.*”” (II.C.3)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

CCDCFS removed the six children from Mother's custody because she was unable to meet their basic needs, maintained deplorable housing conditions, and had substance-abuse and domestic-violence issues. During more than two years of agency custody, Mother repeatedly tested positive for cocaine and alcohol, did not successfully complete substance-abuse treatment, maintained a relationship with a violent boyfriend, failed to provide consistently adequate housing, and exercised visitation inconsistently. The children were doing well in their respective placements, and the guardian ad litem recommended permanent custody for three children, a PPLA for Y.G., and legal custody placements for T.G. and L.G.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

CCDCFS filed neglect complaints in February 2023, and the juvenile court placed the six children in emergency and then temporary agency custody. After more than two years of agency custody and unsuccessful case-plan efforts, the juvenile court entered dispositions placing three children in CCDCFS's permanent custody, two in the legal custody of caregivers, and one in a PPLA. Mother appealed, arguing that the dispositions were against the manifest weight of the evidence. The appellate court overruled the assignment of error and affirmed.

DISPOSITION

affirmed

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The court ordered that a special mandate issue directing the common pleas court, juvenile division, to carry the judgment into execution. No substantive remand was ordered.

CASES CITED

- Santosky v. Kramer, 455 U.S. 745, 753 (1982)
- In re J.B., 2013-Ohio-1704, ¶ 66 (8th Dist.)
- In re Hoffman, 2002-Ohio-5368, ¶ 14
- In re Hayes, 79 Ohio St.3d 46, 48 (1997)
- In re Smith, 77 Ohio App.3d 1, 16 (6th Dist. 1991)
- In re L.G., 2022-Ohio-529, ¶ 49 (8th Dist.)
- In re L.D., 2017-Ohio-1037, ¶ 29
- In re Cunningham, 59 Ohio St.2d 100, 106 (1979)
- In re Hitchcock, 120 Ohio App.3d 88, 102 (8th Dist. 1996)
- In re N.B., 2015-Ohio-314, ¶ 67
- In re P.S., 2023-Ohio-144, ¶ 26
- In re S.C., 2018-Ohio-2523, ¶ 20 (8th Dist.)

- In re D.H., 2021-Ohio-3821, ¶ 27 (8th Dist.)
- In re L.W., 2017-Ohio-657, ¶ 28 (8th Dist.)
- In re H.G., 2024-Ohio-3408, ¶ 16
- In re T.B., 2014-Ohio-2051, ¶ 28
- Cross v. Ledford, 161 Ohio St. 469, 477 (1954)
- In re Z.C., 2023-Ohio-4703, ¶¶ 11, 14, 20-21
- Seasons Coal Co., Inc. v. Cleveland, 10 Ohio St.3d 77, 80 (1984)
- In re A.F., 2023-Ohio-4423, ¶ 41 (8th Dist.)
- In re S.C., 2022-Ohio-356, ¶ 38 (10th Dist.)
- In re A.M., 2020-Ohio-5102, ¶ 31
- In re Schaefer, 2006-Ohio-5513, ¶ 56
- In re H.H. J.H., 2021-Ohio-1732, ¶ 31 (10th Dist.)
- In re A.B., 2006-Ohio-4359, ¶ 33
- In re K.C., 2025-Ohio-5047, ¶ 24 (8th Dist.)
- In re S.S., 2025-Ohio-842, ¶ 38 (8th Dist.)
- In re P.V.A., 2023-Ohio-1622, ¶ 16 (11th Dist.)
- In re V.P., 2020-Ohio-5626, ¶ 32 (8th Dist.)
- In re D.T., 2014-Ohio-4818, ¶ 20 (8th Dist.)
- In re E.A., 2013-Ohio-1193, ¶ 13 (8th Dist.)