IN THE FAMILY COURT OF NOVA SCOTIA

Citation: Nova Scotia (Community Services) v. S.J.D., 2009 NSFC 2

Date: (20090116)

Docket: FANCFSA-054420

Registry: Yarmouth

Between:

Minister of Community Services (Annapolis County)

Applicant

v.

S.J.D., B.B. and P.R.

Respondents

LIBRARY HEADING

Publication restriction: Publishers of this case please take note that <u>Section 94(1)</u> of the <u>Children and Family Services Act</u> applies and may require editing of this judgment or its heading before publication. <u>Section 94</u> provides:

94(1) No person shall publish or make public information that has the effect of identifying a child who is a witness or a participant in a hearing or the subject of a proceeding pursuant to this Act, or a parent or a guardian, a foster parent or a relative of the child.

Judge: The Honourable Judge John D. Comeau, Chief Judge of

the Family Court of Nova Scotia

Heard: October 9, 2008, in Comeauville, Nova Scotia

October 21, 2008, in Digby, Nova Scotia

Decision Date: January 16, 2009

Subject: Disposition review under Section 46 of the Children and Family

Services Act.

Summary: At apprehension the child, born March *, 2007 was placed by

agreement, of the Minister, with the maternal grandmother. On disposition the placement was confirmed. The Minister now asks for permanent care and custody stating that the placement was short term only. The Minister did not file a new Plan of Care but relies on the evidence of a professional (assessor). The evidence was not disputed

that the parents were unable to care for the child.

Issue: Whether the Minister has proved a change in circumstances to warrant

a review and whether the Minister's Plan of Care is the least intrusive

method and in the child's best interest.

Result: The proceeding as a whole was dismissed. No further Supervision

Order was available under the Act. The Minister has not proved a change in circumstances nor that permanent care and custody was the least intrusive method and in the child's best interest. The Minister did not provide the Court with a long term Plan of Care for the child. A Custody Order under the **Maintenance and Custody Act** was issued by consent giving the maternal grandmother custody. Access

to the parents was to be arranged through her.

Editorial Notice

Identifying information has been removed from this electronic version of the judgment.

THIS INFORMATION SHEET DOES NOT FORM PART OF THE COURT'S DECISION. QUOTES MUST BE FROM THE DECISION, NOT THIS LIBRARY SHEET