MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS
WESTERN DISTRICT

IN RE: S.H.P. AND A.L.P.,
JUVENILES
A.S.,
APPELLANT
L.M.,
RESPONDENT

vs.

N.B.,
DEFENDANT
C.P.,
DEFENDANT

DOCKET NUMBER WD84181

DATE: NOVEMBER 16, 2021

Appeal from:

The Circuit Court of Jackson County, Missouri
The Honorable Jalilah Otto, Judge

Appellate Judges:

Division One: W. Douglas Thomson, Presiding Judge, Alok Ahuja, Judge and Karen King Mitchell, Judge

---

Attorneys:

Allison G. Kort, for Appellant

Karen L. Rosenberg, for Respondent

MISSOURI APPELLATE COURT OPINION SUMMARY

MISSOURI COURT OF APPEALS
WESTERN DISTRICT

IN RE: S.H.P. AND A.L.P., JUVENILES,
A.S., APPELLANT,
L.M., RESPONDENT,
v.
N.B., DEFENDANT,
C.P., DEFENDANT.

WD84181 Jackson County

Division One: W. Douglas Thomson, Presiding Judge, Alok Ahuja, Judge and Karen King Mitchell, Judge

A.S. appeals the judgment of the Jackson County Circuit Court denying her petition for adoption of the minor children and granting L.M.'s petition for adoption. A.S. raises three points on appeal. In her first point, A.S. argues that the trial court erred in evaluating the children's best interests according to the statutory factors provided in Missouri's child custody statute, Section 452.375. In her second point, A.S. contends that if she is incorrect in her first point's assertion, then the trial court erred in misapplying the law by not addressing all of the Section 452.375 best-interest factors. In her third point, A.S. argues that the trial court abused its discretion in refusing to allow evidence regarding the children's preferences as to their custodian.

AFFIRMED.

Division One holds:

As to A.S.'s first point on appeal, A.S. failed to assert her objection during the proceedings and failed to otherwise raise her contention in a post-trial motion. As a result, A.S.'s first point was not preserved for appellate review and is denied. As to A.S.'s second point on appeal, the trial court did not misapply the law in not addressing all of the Section 452.375 best-interest factors in that the trial court could appoint a myriad of factors, including some or all of the factors recited therein. As to A.S.'s third point on appeal, because A.S. failed to comply with Rule 84.04, it is deemed abandoned and dismissed.

Opinion by: W. Douglas Thomson, Judge Date: November 16, 2021

This summary is *UNOFFICIAL* and should not be quoted or cited.