NON-PRECEDENTIAL DECISION - SEE SUPERIOR COURT O.P. 65.37

IN THE INTEREST OF: S.A.F.N., A MINOR	:	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA
APPEAL OF: V.H., MOTHER	:	
	:	No. 60 EDA 2026

Appeal from the Decree Entered December 4, 2025
In the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County Juvenile Division at No(s): CP-51-AP-0000461-2024

IN THE INTEREST OF: I.T.B.N., A MINOR	:	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA
APPEAL OF: V.H., MOTHER	:	
	:	No. 61 EDA 2026

Appeal from the Decree Entered December 4, 2025
In the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County Juvenile Division at No(s): CP-51-AP-0000464-2024

IN THE INTEREST OF: S.A.F.N., A MINOR	:	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA
APPEAL OF: C.C.N., FATHER	:	
	:	No. 62 EDA 2026

Appeal from the Order Entered December 3, 2025
In the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County Juvenile Division at No(s): CP-51-DP-0000380-2021

IN THE INTEREST OF: S.A.F.N., A MINOR	:	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA
APPEAL OF: C.C.N., FATHER	:	
	:	No. 63 EDA 2026

Appeal from the Order Entered December 4, 2025
In the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County Juvenile Division at No(s): CP-51-AP-0000461-2024

IN THE INTEREST OF: I.N., A MINOR	:	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA
APPEAL OF: C.C.N., FATHER	:	
	:	No. 64 EDA 2026

Appeal from the Order Entered December 3, 2025
In the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County Juvenile Division at No(s): CP-51-DP-0000381-2021

IN THE INTEREST OF: I.T.B.N., A MINOR	:	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA
APPEAL OF: C.C.N., FATHER	:	
	:	No. 65 EDA 2026

Appeal from the Decree Entered December 4, 2025
In the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County Juvenile Division at No(s): CP-51-AP-0000464-2024

BEFORE: PANELLA, P.J.E., NICHOLS, J., and NEUMAN, J.

MEMORANDUM BY PANELLA, P.J.E.: **FILED SEPTEMBER 21, 2026**

V.H. ("Mother") and C.C.N. ("Father") (collectively, "Parents") have each appealed the December 4, 2025 decrees that granted petitions filed by the Philadelphia Department of Human Services ("DHS") and involuntarily terminated their parental rights to their daughter, S.A.F.N., born June 2019, and their son, I.N. a/k/a I.T.B.N. (collectively with S.A.F.N., "the Children"), born July 2020. Separately, Father has appealed the December 3, 2025 dependency orders that changed the Children's respective permanency goals from reunification to adoption. We hereby remand for the trial court to prepare an opinion pursuant to Pa.R.A.P.1925(a)(2)(ii).[1]

Due to the nature of our disposition, we need not provide a detailed factual and procedural history of these cases. On December 23, 2024, the Philadelphia Department of Human Services ("DHS") filed petitions requesting that the Children's permanency goals be changed from reunification to adoption. The same day, DHS also filed petitions seeking to involuntarily terminate Parents' parental rights. Following hearings that were held on October 14 and December 3, 2025, the trial court entered dependency orders on December 3, 2025 that changed the Children's permanency goals from reunification to adoption. On December 4, 2025, the trial court similarly

---

[1] We consolidated these appeals *sua sponte* as Parents raise similar claims concerning the same factual and procedural events. ***See*** Pa.R.A.P. 513.

entered decrees that involuntarily terminated Parents' respective parental rights pursuant to 23 Pa.C.S.A. § 2511(a)(1), (2), (5), (8), and (b).

On January 1, 2026, Mother timely filed notices of appeal from the termination decrees along with concise statements of errors complained of on appeal pursuant to Rule 1925(a)(2)(i) and (b). On January 2, 2026, Father timely filed notices of appeal with respect to both the termination decrees and the goal change orders entered by the trial court, along with Rule 1925(a)(2)(i) and (b) concise statements.[2]

In lieu of comprehensive Rule 1925(a)(2)(ii) opinions, the trial court filed several "notices of compliance" that essentially referred this Court to the entirety of the relevant transcripts and exhibits entered during the underlying hearings in support of its holdings. ***See*** Trial Court's Notice of Compliance with Rule of Appellate Procedure 1925(a), 1/13/26, at 1-2 (Father's appeals) (citing N.T., 10/14/25, at 6-90, 102); Trial Court's Notice of Compliance with Rule of Appellate Procedure 1925(a), 1/13/26, at 1-2 (Mother's appeals) (citing N.T., 10/14/25, at 6-90, 102). The trial court further asserts that its

---

[2] In his notices of appeal with respect to the December 3, 2025 goal change orders, we note that Father erroneously indicates that these orders were filed on August 7, 2024. Although we caution counsel to act with greater diligence in the future, this Court has previously held that merely listing an incorrect date on an otherwise timely notice of appeal constitutes a harmless error that does not prevent us from reviewing the subject appeal. ***See Commonwealth v. One 1988 Ford Coupe VIN No. 1FABP41A9JF143651***, 574 A.2d 631, 633 n.1 (Pa. Super. 1990) (holding that error in notice of appeal stating incorrect date on which order was entered was "harmless").

"primary statement" regarding the termination of parental rights and the goal change orders appears on two pages of testimony from the December 3, 2025 hearing. ***Id.*** The trial court claims that, therein, it "addressed the determination that it is in the best interest of the Children to have [Parents'] parental rights terminated and for a goal change to adoption." ***Id.*** (citing N.T., 12/3/25, at 11-12). We must disagree.

As a general proposition, "Rule 1925(a) **requires** the trial court to prepare an opinion in a termination of parental rights case if the reasons for the termination decree are not otherwise indicated in the record." ." ***In the Int. of J.T.M.***, ___ A.3d ___, 2026 WL 2110224, at *2 (Pa. Super. 2026) (citing Pa.R.A.P. 1925(a)(2)(ii)) (emphasis in original). The importance of a comprehensive Rule 1925(a) opinion in this context cannot be overstated: "We recognize the heightened import of this judicial duty in the context of family law matters, particularly termination of parental rights cases, where the significant gravity of a termination of parental rights . . . has far-reaching and intentionally irreversible consequences for the parents and the child." ***Id.*** (citations omitted). Overall, "the trial court has the responsibility to provide an independent judicial analysis for purposes of our appellate review," which must evidence the court's "consideration and analysis **of each statutory ground for termination**[.]" ***Id.*** (citations omitted; emphasis added).

Here, the on-the-record statement offered by the trial court was, respectfully, cursory at best and did not evince the individualized fact-finding

and careful legal determinations required in this context. Critically, the trial court does not provide a summary of the relevant facts, the procedural history of the above-captioned cases, issue credibility determinations, or fully articulate the reasons for its decisions. The trial court does not engage in any meaningful analysis of the specific reasons it chose to involuntarily terminate Parents' parental rights, or its decision change the Children's permanency goals, with reference to the specific, underlying statutory bases.

In the absence of a Rule 1925(a) opinion or, at a minimum, an adequate on-the-record statement from the trial judge "'explaining its individualized and considered reasons'" for terminating Parents' parental rights and changing the Children's permanency goal, "'this Court is unable to conduct meaningful appellate review.'" ***Id.*** (*quoting* ***In re K.O.C.***, 325 A.3d 854, 858 (Pa. Super. 2024)); ***see also Commonwealth v. DeJesus***, 868 A.2d 379, 383 (Pa. 2005) ("[I]n any case where the trial court fails to prepare an opinion that addresses the issues upon which it passed and which are raised by a party on appeal, the net result is the same: the appellate court is deprived of explication and guidance on those issues from the judicial entity most familiar with the matter."). "[T]his dereliction of duty cannot be overlooked in light of the significant consequences of the trial court's decrees." ***K.O.C.***, 325 A.3d at 858 (citing ***In re Adoption of C.M.***, 255 A.3d 343, 358 (Pa. 2021)).

Based upon the foregoing, we remand this case for the trial court to file, within thirty days from the date of this memorandum, fully compliant Rule

1925(a) opinion(s) that provide a summary of the relevant facts, the procedural history of the Children's dependency and adoption cases, and fully articulates the reasons for its decisions with respect to both Parents. Specifically, the trial court shall individually address each of the statutory grounds upon which the court terminated Parents' parental rights as to each child, with appropriate findings, credibility determinations, and legal analysis. Similarly, the trial court shall also address its decision to change the Children's permanency goals from reunification to adoption in commensurate detail. ***See J.T.M.***, 2026 WL 2110224, at *3; ***see also Interest of C.S.***, 359 A.3d 1219, 2026 WL 948706, at *1-*2 (Pa. Super. 2026) (unpublished memorandum).[3]

The Prothonotary of this Court is directed to remand the certified record in these matters to aid the trial court in its preparation of the Rule 1925(a) opinion(s). Thereafter, the trial court shall return the certified record to this Court upon the completion of the opinion(s).

Case remanded with instructions. Panel jurisdiction retained.

---

[3] An unpublished or "non-precedential decision" of the Superior Court filed on or after May 1, 2019, may be cited for its persuasive value. Pa.R.A.P. 126(b).