

Pursuant to Ind.Appellate Rule 65(D), this Memorandum Decision shall not be regarded as precedent or cited before any court except for the purpose of establishing the defense of res judicata, collateral estoppel, or the law of the case.

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT:

ATTORNEY FOR APPELLEE:

STEVEN J. HALBERT

TAMMI FORSTER

Carmel, Indiana

Indianapolis, Indiana

**IN THE
COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA**

IN THE MATTER OF THE INVOLUNTARY)
TERMINATION OF PARENT-CHILD)
RELATIONSHIP OF A.P., M.P., AND S.P.,)
AND THEIR MOTHER)

MARY PALMERO,)

Appellant-Respondent,)

vs.)

No. 49A02-0706-JV-470

MARION COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF)
CHILD SERVICES,)

Appellee-Petitioner,)

CHILD ADVOCATES, INC.,)

APPEAL FROM THE MARION SUPERIOR COURT
The Honorable Danielle Gaughan, Magistrate
The Honorable Marilyn Moores, Judge
Cause No. 49D09-0503-JT-10043

December 27, 2007

MEMORANDUM DECISION - NOT FOR PUBLICATION

SHARPNACK, Judge

This case comes to us on appeal from an order terminating the parental rights of Mary Palmero to M.P., A.P., and S.P. The order included in the record reflects that it was signed by the magistrate presiding over the case but does not indicate that the juvenile court judge approved entry of the order. The docket indicates that the order was approved on May 22, 2007, but there is no indication as to how this approval was accomplished.

The authority of magistrates to act is determined by statute. As provided in Ind. Code §§ 33-23-5-5(14) and 33-23-5-9(b), a magistrate presiding at a criminal trial may enter a final order, conduct a sentencing hearing, and impose a sentence on a person convicted of a criminal offense. There is no such provision for magistrates to act in termination of parental rights cases. Rather, Ind. Code § 33-23-5-9(a) provides that, except in criminal proceedings, a magistrate “shall report findings” in an evidentiary hearing or a trial and that “the court shall enter the final order.” Because the record does not establish judicial approval of the magistrate’s findings in this case, we remand to the juvenile court for its consideration and further action consistent with this opinion. We retain jurisdiction of this appeal pending action by the juvenile court.

Remanded.

BARNES, J. and VAIDIK, J. concur