

NOTICE

This order was filed under Supreme Court Rule 23 and may not be cited as precedent by any party except in the limited circumstances allowed under Rule 23(e)(1).

2018 IL App (4th) 170642-U

NO. 4-17-0642

IN THE APPELLATE COURT

OF ILLINOIS

FOURTH DISTRICT

FILED

January 16, 2018
Carla Bender
4th District Appellate
Court, IL

<i>In re</i> L.B., M.B., C.B., O.B., J.P., and L.P., Minors)	Appeal from
)	Circuit Court of
(The People of the State of Illinois,)	Champaign County
Petitioner-Appellee,)	No. 16JA26
v.)	
Amanda Beyers,)	Honorable
Respondent-Appellant).)	Brett N. Olmstead,
)	Judge Presiding.

JUSTICE HOLDER WHITE delivered the judgment of the court.
Presiding Justice Harris and Justice Turner concurred in the judgment.

ORDER

¶ 1 *Held:* The appellate court affirmed, concluding the trial court's order terminating the wardship of the minors and restoring guardianship to their father was not against the manifest weight of the evidence.

¶ 2 In July 2016, the State filed a petition for adjudication of neglect, alleging L.B. (born August 14, 2002), M.B. (born September 17, 2004), O.B. and C.B. (twins, born July 25, 2008), J.P. (born July 27, 2014), and L.P. (born August 22, 2015) were neglected in that their environment was injurious to their welfare. 705 ILCS 405/2-3(1)(b) (West 2014). Respondent, Amanda Beyers, is the mother of the children. This appeal only involves O.B. and C.B. and their father, Harold Skaggs.

¶ 3 In October 2016, the trial court entered an adjudicatory order finding the children were abused or neglected in that their environment was injurious to their welfare. The following month, the court entered a dispositional order making the children wards of the court and

granting custody and guardianship to the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS). In March 2017, following a permanency hearing, the court ordered custody of O.B. and C.B. restored to Skaggs and ordered guardianship to continue with DCFS. In August 2017, the court entered a permanency order (1) finding, in part, respondent and Skaggs had made reasonable progress and efforts toward returning the minors home; and (2) terminating the wardship of O.B. and C.B. and restoring guardianship to Skaggs.

¶ 4 Respondent appeals, arguing the trial court's finding that wardship of O.B. and C.B. should be terminated and guardianship should be restored to Skaggs was contrary to the manifest weight of the evidence. We affirm.

¶ 5 I. BACKGROUND

¶ 6 Respondent's sole argument on appeal involves the trial court's order restoring guardianship of O.B. and C.B. to Skaggs. Accordingly, we summarize only the information necessary to resolve this appeal.

¶ 7 A. Initial Proceedings

¶ 8 In October 2016, the trial court entered an adjudicatory order finding the children were abused or neglected because their environment was injurious to their welfare pursuant to section 2-3(1)(b) of the Juvenile Court Act of 1987 (Juvenile Act) (705 ILCS 405/2-3(1)(b) (West 2014)) in that the children were exposed to domestic violence between respondent and her paramour Stephen Parratt. In November 2016, the court entered a dispositional order finding respondent mother and Skaggs unfit and placing custody and guardianship of the children with DCFS. Specifically, the court entered a written order with the following findings:

"[Respondent] has endured repeated incidents of domestic violence with Mr. Parratt, as well as alcohol abuse and marijuana use, yet

still has unacceptably little appreciation for the causes of those serious problems and the danger they pose to the children and their environment. Instead, she minimizes and outright lies to deflect blame onto external factors and others. Her home can be safe for the children while she works on these problems to become fit and able, but only if [DCFS] has custody and can exercise that level of control and oversight to protect the children, especially given [respondent's] strong desire to resume a relationship with Mr. Parratt as soon as possible and failure to appreciate the danger he and his behavior pose."

The court found Skaggs was doing his best to provide for O.B. and C.B. and play as large a role as possible in their lives. However, the court noted Skaggs had unresolved issues with anxiety and depression, as shown by his continuous renewal of his social security disability benefits. Because Skaggs had not treated these issues through medication, counseling, or other means in approximately 10 years, the court found Skaggs unfit. However, the court granted DCFS discretion to place the children in respondent's home and to allow Skaggs unsupervised visitation with O.B. and C.B.

¶ 9 Skaggs appealed the trial court's dispositional order finding him unfit and placing custody and guardianship with DCFS, which this court docketed as case No. 4-16-0902. In April 2017, this court affirmed the trial court's dispositional order. *In re L.B., M.B., O.B., C.B., J.P., and L.P.*, 2017 IL App (4th) 160902-U.

¶ 10 B. Permanency Hearings

¶ 11 1. *January and March 2017 Permanency Hearing*

¶ 12 The first permanency hearing began January 31, 2017, and was continued to March 7, 2017. The permanency hearing report indicated DCFS became involved following a May 2016 domestic-violence incident involving respondent and Parratt. According to the report, the risk of continued domestic violence was high, as respondent indicated she wished to remain in a relationship with Parratt and there were at least two documented incidents of domestic violence between the two. Both incidents of domestic violence involved alcohol use by respondent, and she had a history of driving-under-the-influence charges, but respondent reported no alcohol abuse. Respondent also tested positive for marijuana, but she reported this was due to accidentally eating a brownie with marijuana in it. The report recommended substance-abuse treatment, counseling, and domestic-violence services. Finally, the report recommended the children remain at home with respondent while she engaged in services.

¶ 13 The permanency hearing report indicated Skaggs had no history of domestic violence. Skaggs had considered the possibility of the twins living with him and indicated he would set up his work schedule to accommodate their needs. Skaggs reported he had looked into an after-school program for the girls and also had support from his grandmother and aunt. According to the report, Skaggs received social security disability income due to depression and did not have full-time employment. Skaggs reported he was diagnosed with depression and anxiety as a teenager and never found a medication that effectively managed his symptoms. Skaggs was not currently on medication or engaged in mental-health services. The report recommended individual therapy to determine whether Skaggs required a referral to a psychiatrist for medication management. The report further recommended continuing Skaggs's current, court-ordered visitation every other weekend (McLean County case No. 09-F-240). In the event respondent did not remain committed to services or allowed Parratt to return to the

home, Skaggs was a viable placement alternative for O.B. and C.B.

¶ 14 An addendum to the permanency hearing report was filed prior to the March 7, 2017, permanency hearing. According to the addendum, respondent had attended three or four domestic-violence classes and had begun counseling. Respondent also enrolled in substance-abuse treatment and completed drug tests. According to the addendum, respondent tested positive for marijuana six times between January 17, 2017, and February 16, 2017. The addendum also indicated Skaggs had completed a psychological evaluation, was engaged in counseling services, and was not currently prescribed any medication.

¶ 15 Following the March 2017 permanency hearing, the State and the guardian *ad litem* (GAL) both recommended the trial court find Skaggs fit, willing, and able to exercise custody of O.B. and C.B., as he had been cooperative with DCFS and engaged in all recommended services. The trial court agreed and found it was in O.B.'s and C.B.'s best interest to return custody to Skaggs as he was fit, able, and willing the care for the minors. The court considered a report from Chestnut Health Systems that indicated Skaggs had no barriers in life skills or functioning. The report noted Skaggs's reliance on social security disability benefits stemmed from an event that was limited in time and "created some dependency on the system." Accordingly, the court ordered custody of O.B. and C.B. restored to Skaggs and ordered guardianship to continue with DCFS. The court further found respondent had made reasonable efforts and progress.

¶ 16 *2. May 2017 Permanency Hearing*

¶ 17 In May 2017, DCFS filed another permanency report that indicated O.B. and C.B. were in Skaggs's custody and had unsupervised visitation with respondent every weekend. The report noted DCFS initially allowed telephone contact between respondent and the twins but

later changed the contact due to respondent harassing Skaggs via text messages and telephone calls. Accordingly, DCFS requested respondent only contact Skaggs in the event of an emergency or to discuss the twins' medical information. According to the report, the social worker visited O.B. and C.B. in Skaggs's home and they were the most relaxed and playful the social worker had ever seen. Skaggs's psychological evaluation recommended he continue counseling, but he was functioning well enough to provide a safe and secure environment for O.B. and C.B. A progress report from Chestnut Health Systems indicated Skaggs regularly attended counseling sessions and was actively engaged. Skaggs's reported symptoms of anxiety had decreased with the twins in his custody. Skaggs also obtained employment with State Farm Insurance.

¶ 18 Reports from the Center for Youth and Family Services indicated C.B. and O.B. adjusted well to living with Skaggs. The twins reported they liked their new school in Bloomington and had made friends. Although the twins reported missing respondent, O.B. reported she was able to call respondent during the week. A court-appointed special advocate (CASA) report indicated Skaggs was an involved parent, communicating regularly with the twins' teacher, taking the girls to counseling, and arranging for their medical needs. The CASA report indicated exchanges between Skaggs and respondent were smoother and respondent no longer screamed or swore at Skaggs.

¶ 19 The May 2017 permanency report indicated respondent was engaged in individual counseling services, substance-abuse treatment, and domestic-violence classes. The report noted respondent instigated many verbal arguments with Skaggs and DCFS, but the disagreements decreased as respondent began to demonstrate more self control. Respondent's psychological evaluation recommended she continue counseling and random drug screens, complete domestic-

violence classes, and provide a safe environment for the children.

¶ 20 Following the May 2017 permanency hearing, Skaggs requested that guardianship of O.B. and C.B. be restored to him. The trial court found it in the best interest of O.B. and C.B. to continue guardianship with DCFS and denied Skaggs's request to return guardianship to him. The court noted Skaggs and respondent coordinated visitation before DCFS involvement, but those transitions were not smooth. Because the twins were still transitioning to living with Skaggs and respondent still had services to complete, the court ordered guardianship of O.B. and C.B. continue with DCFS. However, the court noted Skaggs was making reasonable efforts and progress and was quickly approaching the point where it would be appropriate to return guardianship of O.B. and C.B. to him.

¶ 21 *3. Motion To Reconsider*

¶ 22 In June 2017, Skaggs filed a motion to reconsider the denial of the request to return guardianship of O.B. and C.B. to him. The motion alleged the caseworker increased respondent's visitation with O.B. and C.B. and intended to continue to increase her visitation "to the point where it [was] unclear whether the children would return to Bloomington for school in the fall." The motion alleged this possibility would destabilize O.B. and C.B. and cause uncertainty regarding where and with whom they would reside. Additionally, the motion alleged the corresponding McLean County family case could address any future problems arising from respondent's visitation.

¶ 23 In July 2017, the trial court held a hearing on the motion to reconsider and heard the following evidence. Robin Strauss, a child-welfare specialist with DCFS, testified respondent's visitation with O.B. and C.B. had been increased from one day a week to two days a week. Strauss increased respondent's visitation approximately six weeks before the hearing

because she had been engaging in services and cooperating with DCFS. Strauss testified respondent's visitation could increase even further if she continued to engage in services and make progress. According to Strauss, the twins would currently stay with their father and attend school in Bloomington. However, if respondent had custody restored to her, DCFS would consider increasing her visitation so the twins would spend the majority of their time with her and attend school in Champaign. Strauss testified placement of the twins was up in the air because she did not know when respondent would complete her services and be restored to fitness.

¶ 24 According to Strauss, Skaggs was cooperative with services and was engaged in counseling. Strauss testified there were no concerns regarding Skaggs's ability to parent O.B. and C.B. Respondent completed a psychological evaluation, substance-abuse treatment, and "parenting" within her counseling services. However, respondent had yet to complete counseling and domestic-violence classes. According to Strauss, respondent still planned to have Parratt return to her home. Respondent and Parratt needed to engage in couples counseling before Parratt could begin visitation with the minor children. Strauss anticipated couples counseling would begin "within the next month or so," although it had not been established yet.

¶ 25 Strauss visited O.B. and C.B. in Skaggs's home approximately two weeks before the hearing on the motion to reconsider. In the past, the twins were "[v]ery reserved and quiet." However, when Strauss visited them in Skaggs's home, they were open, communicative, and appeared comfortable in the home. According to Strauss, respondent and Skaggs had some difficulties when picking up or dropping off the twins, but the situation recently improved with Skaggs taking steps to keep communication amicable. Conversations between Skaggs and respondent tended to become volatile, so Strauss advised Skaggs he needed to share important

information, such as medical information, but he did not need to answer every telephone call from respondent.

¶ 26 Skaggs testified he immediately enrolled the twins in school after the trial court ordered custody of the twins be restored to him. According to Skaggs, the teacher reported the twins did well in school, were respectful, and were well-behaved. Skaggs enrolled the twins in gymnastics classes, soccer camp, basketball camp, and a summer reading program. The twins often saw friends from school at these activities and Skaggs obtained contact information for some friends to arrange play dates. Skaggs paid for the gymnastics classes and for a pool pass, and he provided transportation for all of the twins' activities.

¶ 27 According to Skaggs, there were some issues with respondent calling to speak to the twins and belittling his parenting abilities. Skaggs mentioned the problems to Strauss, and Strauss instructed respondent to refrain from calling or texting Skaggs because some of her communications were inappropriate. Skaggs acknowledged there were some problems when picking up and dropping off the twins. However, Skaggs discussed strategies with his counselor for dealing with respondent, and he began choosing not to respond when respondent became volatile.

¶ 28 Skaggs testified he had spoken with his attorney about adjusting the orders in the family case (McLean County case No. 09-F-240), which had previously ordered visitation for Skaggs with the twins every other weekend and on various holidays. According to Skaggs, his attorney had two motions ready to file with the McLean County court seeking (1) a temporary order to have the twins stay in his custody in Bloomington schools, and (2) a modification of the allocation of parenting time. The motions had yet to be filed because there were concerns regarding the McLean County court's ability or willingness to enter orders regarding children

that were wards of the court in Champaign County.

¶ 29 According to Skaggs, O.B. and C.B. asked him multiple times where they would be attending school in the fall. Skaggs testified, "Previously I just had to tell them that I wasn't sure, that I was going to try to keep them with me to go to school, but I wasn't sure. The last visit with [the] DCFS case worker, Robin Strauss, she informed the children that there was a pretty good chance that they would be attending school [with] me, but there was no guidelines on how long or no 100% guarantee." According to Skaggs, he was seeking guardianship because he wanted to provide the twins with consistency and stability. Skaggs testified he already made arrangements for the twins to continue their counseling in the event guardianship was restored to him. Skaggs also testified he would ensure the twins maintained a relationship with respondent.

¶ 30 The trial court acknowledged the instability caused by continuing the wardship, noting it was unclear who was "calling the shots" and visitation changes were being made by DCFS in working toward returning the children to respondent. The court noted the practical difficulties restoring guardianship of O.B. and C.B. to Skaggs would raise, including a loss of oversight by DCFS as respondent continued to work toward fitness. The court also noted that DCFS provided a buffer and Strauss helped facilitate communication between respondent and Skaggs. The court found there was no urgency to address the issue of guardianship immediately, as opposed to waiting until the next permanency hearing in August. Accordingly, the court denied the motion to reconsider.

¶ 31 *4. August 2017 Permanency Hearing*

¶ 32 At the August 2017 permanency hearing, the trial court considered, in part, an updated permanency report and an updated CASA report. The court also admitted into evidence respondent's group exhibit No. 1, which included photographs of a hike with the children, a

Cognition Works report, a Choices letter, and a letter from the Community Resource and Counseling Center. Finally, the court admitted Skaggs's exhibit Nos. 1, 2, and 3, which were filings in McLean County case No. 09-F-240, including (1) a notice of hearing for August 24, 2017; (2) a petition for temporary allocation of parental responsibilities; and (3) a petition to modify allocation of parental responsibilities. The court considered Skaggs's exhibits for the limited purpose that there was a proceeding pending in McLean County.

¶ 33 The updated permanency report indicated respondent was making reasonable efforts and satisfactory progress. Respondent actively participated in counseling and completed substance-abuse treatment. Once her domestic-violence classes were completed at the end of August 2017, respondent and Parratt would begin couples counseling. Respondent was referred for family-habilitation services, but she did not see a benefit and was often unavailable to meet with the habilitation worker. The report indicated respondent continued to complete drug tests once a week.

¶ 34 The permanency report showed Skaggs completed individual counseling services. His counselor "report[ed] there [wa]s little evidence Mr. Skaggs['s] symptoms of depression and anxiety interfere[d] with daily functioning." However, Skaggs remained unemployed and continued to receive social-security-disability benefits.

¶ 35 As to O.B. and C.B., the permanency report showed the twins continued to engage in counseling services. The counselor reported the children transitioned well to living with Skaggs and had a positive experience at their new school, where they were able to make friends. The counselor recommended the twins remain in their current placement with Skaggs due to the level of stability they achieved there.

¶ 36 The CASA report indicated O.B. and C.B. were thriving with Skaggs and detailed

the twins' activities, including gymnastics, soccer, basketball, and swimming. Respondent reported concerns about the twins not being honest about their father, but the twins only reported two "very minor incidents typical of any family," which did not cause the CASA concern. The CASA also observed an exchange between the parents because respondent told her the twins were upset at exchanges. However, the CASA saw no evidence the twins were upset about anything at the exchange. The CASA report concluded Skaggs was an excellent, engaged father and expressed the CASA's hope that his home would become a permanent placement for the twins.

¶ 37 At the permanency hearing, the State recommended custody of O.B. and C.B. remain with Skaggs and guardianship of the twins should be restored to him. The State expressed concern over the state of respondent's house and her unwillingness to be honest and forthright with DCFS. The GAL also argued Skaggs was an appropriate parent and the twins were thriving in his care. Accordingly, the GAL recommended guardianship of the twins be restored to Skaggs.

¶ 38 Counsel for respondent argued she had made progress and worked very hard to keep her family together. Counsel noted four of respondent's children remained in the home with respondent on an extended overnight visitation and no one suggested removing those children from her home. Counsel requested custody of all six children be returned to respondent and argued Skaggs had not contributed to raising the twins until DCFS got involved.

¶ 39 Skaggs joined the State and the GAL in recommending guardianship of the twins be restored to him. Skaggs noted the discharge summary from his counseling was positive and stated (1) his anxiety did not affect his ability to care for the children and (2) he learned strategies for coping with the unpredictability of respondent's behavior. The trial court

interrupted and noted it had no concerns about the safety of the children. The court reiterated its earlier position that the wardship of O.B. and C.B. was valuable because it gave Skaggs a resource if there were ongoing issues with respondent's living situation or substance abuse. The court noted, if the wardship was terminated and guardianship of the twins was restored to Skaggs, Skaggs would have to raise any issues on his own in the McLean County family case without the benefit of DCFS resources and oversight.

¶ 40 In response, Skaggs argued the path to permanency for the twins was through the McLean County family case that could address issues the present court was not meant to address, including where the girls would live, communication between the parents, and the sharing of educational and medical information. Although the court previously ordered the twins would attend school in Bloomington in the fall, the possibility still existed that DCFS might later increase respondent's visitation such that the girls would have to change schools again. Counsel for Skaggs noted the number of fathers involved in the neglect case and the extent of the domestic violence and substance-abuse concerns, and she argued continuing the wardship would continue the uncertainty in the twins' lives. Finally, Skaggs argued he was essentially on his own for the prior few months without any resources or assistance from DCFS because the caseworker only worked with him to collect information to pass along to the court.

¶ 41 In ruling on the guardianship issue, the trial court noted there were two ways of viewing the continued guardianship. On the one hand, maintaining the guardianship allowed DCFS to remain involved. Essentially, this allowed for oversight of the entire situation by third parties, giving Skaggs access to information he might not otherwise have and allowing for third parties to gather and provide information to the court. On the other hand, the court noted respondent continuously acted as if there were secrets to be kept from DCFS. The court further

noted the guardianship was preventing the McLean County court from entering final orders in the family case, and the court found the guardianship was more obstructive than helpful.

Accordingly, the court entered an order terminating the wardship and discharging the DCFS guardianship administrator.

¶ 42 This appeal followed.

¶ 43 II. ANALYSIS

¶ 44 On appeal, respondent asserts the trial court abused its discretion by returning guardianship of O.B. and C.B. to Skaggs and terminating the court's wardship. Specifically, respondent argues (1) Skaggs did not introduce evidence contradicting the court's July 2017 conclusion that DCFS served as a necessary buffer between himself and respondent, and (2) the court placed too much weight on the evidence of the filings in the McLean County family case (No. 09-F-240).

¶ 45 Section 2-28 of the Juvenile Act sets forth the procedure for the trial court to review an abuse or neglect case through a series of permanency hearings. 705 ILCS 405/2-28 (West 2016). Permanency hearings "are simply further dispositional hearings, conducted in accordance with section 2-22(1) of the [Juvenile] Act, which governs how dispositional hearings are to be held." *In re S.M.*, 223 Ill. App. 3d 543, 547, 585 N.E.2d 641, 644 (1992). Accordingly, the evidentiary rules applicable to dispositional hearings also apply to permanency hearings. *Id.* At a dispositional or permanency hearing, "[a]ll evidence helpful in determining these questions, including oral and written reports, may be admitted and may be relied upon to the extent of its probative value." 705 ILCS 405/2-22(1) (West 2016).

¶ 46 Once the trial court enters the initial finding of abuse or neglect, it is proper and consistent with the purpose of the Juvenile Act for the court to exercise broad authority "to

modify orders in a manner that serves the best interests of the minor." *In re Terrell L.*, 368 Ill. App. 3d 1041, 1046, 859 N.E.2d 113, 118 (2006). This court gives great weight to the trial court's superior opportunity to observe the conduct and demeanor of the witnesses and the parties. *In re W.B., Jr.*, 213 Ill. App. 3d 274, 282, 571 N.E.2d 1120, 1126 (1991). "We will reverse a trial court's dispositional determination only if the findings of fact are against the manifest weight of the evidence, or if the trial court committed an abuse of discretion by selecting an inappropriate dispositional order." *In re M.M.*, 2015 IL App (3d) 130856, ¶ 11, 40 N.E.3d 37.

¶ 47 Respondent first contends the trial court's order terminating wardship of O.B. and C.B. and restoring guardianship to Skaggs was against the manifest weight of the evidence. Specifically, respondent contends Skaggs did not introduce evidence contradicting the court's July 2017 conclusion that DCFS served as a necessary buffer between the parents.

¶ 48 We first note the trial court, in entering the July 2017 order denying Skaggs' motion to reconsider the May 2017 permanency order, specifically found no urgency to restore guardianship of O.B. and C.B. prior to the scheduled August 2017 permanency hearing. At that time, the court remarked upon the instability the wardship was causing, noting it was unclear who was "calling the shots" and DCFS made visitation changes geared toward returning the children to respondent. However, the court determined it was appropriate to wait until the August permanency hearing to address the issue of guardianship.

¶ 49 At the August 2017 permanency hearing, the trial court considered updated permanency and CASA reports and various exhibits, including copies of petitions Skaggs filed in McLean County case No. 09-F-240 to change the allocation of parental responsibilities. The updated permanency report noted respondent had completed some services but had yet to begin

couples counseling with Parratt. The report noted O.B. and C.B. transitioned well to living with Skaggs and they liked their new school. Additionally, their counselor recommended they remain with Skaggs due to the level of stability they achieved there. The updated CASA report indicated the twins were thriving with Skaggs. The CASA observed an exchange between the parents because respondent reported the twins were upset at exchanges. According to the CASA, the twins were not at all upset at the exchange and everything went smoothly.

¶ 50 In making its ruling, the trial court noted it was not concerned for the twins' safety, but it was primarily concerned with the impact losing DCFS oversight might have. However, Skaggs argued DCFS involvement was hampering stability in the twins' lives because it was uncertain whether respondent's visitation would be increased to the point the girls would have to change schools again. Moreover, there was no definite time frame for resolution of the juvenile-abuse-and-neglect case, as respondent had yet to begin couples' counseling with Parratt and the father of another child had recently been added as a new party in the case. Although the court considered the third-party oversight valuable, it determined it was in the twins' best interest to restore guardianship to Skaggs because it would lead to permanency and stability more quickly. In particular, the court found the guardianship was more obstructive than helpful because it was preventing the court in McLean County from entering orders on Skaggs' petitions to change the allocation of parental responsibilities.

¶ 51 Although the trial court found DCFS served a useful purpose as a buffer between Skaggs and respondent in July 2017, it is clear the court changed its mind based on the updated reports and the CASA's observance of a smooth exchange. The court found persuasive that Skaggs could adequately raise any issues in the McLean County family case and the continued wardship only added to the instability in O.B.'s and C.B.'s lives. The evidence showed the twins

were thriving in Skaggs's care, Skaggs had completed all his recommended services, respondent had yet to complete her services or begin couples counseling, and another father had recently been made a party to the juvenile case. Given these circumstances, we conclude the court's determination that continuing the wardship hindered rather than helped O.B. and C.B. attain permanency and stability in their lives was not against the manifest weight of the evidence.

¶ 52 Finally, respondent argues the trial court gave undue weight to the pending proceedings in McLean County. We disagree. First, the court explicitly stated it considered Skaggs's petitions to change the allocation of parental responsibilities only insofar as they showed a pending proceeding. The court did not consider the substance of those petitions, nor did the court consider the possible outcomes, as respondent contends. Rather, the court appropriately considered Skaggs's fitness and the fact that future issues regarding the allocation of parental responsibilities could be addressed in the ongoing family case in McLean County. See *In re C.L.*, 384 Ill. App. 3d 689, 695-96, 894 N.E.2d 949, 955 (2008) (affirming the trial court's decision to close the juvenile files and allow the family court to address the remaining parental issues). We conclude nothing in the record shows the trial court abused its discretion in terminating the wardship of O.B. and C.B. and restoring guardianship to Skaggs. Accordingly, we affirm the trial court's judgment.

¶ 53 III. CONCLUSION

¶ 54 Based on the foregoing, we affirm the trial court's judgment.

¶ 55 Affirmed.