



OKLAHOMA STATE COURTS NETWORK

[Previous Case](#) [Top Of Index](#) [This Point in Index](#) [Citationize](#) [Next Case](#)

IN THE MATTER OF THE ADOPTION OF C.G., and P.P.

2026 OK CIV APP 24

Case Number: 123403

Decided: 06/16/2026

Mandate Issued: 07/16/2026

COURT OF CIVIL APPEALS OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA, DIVISION II



Cite as: 2026 OK CIV APP 24, __ P.3d __

IN THE MATTER OF THE ADOPTION OF C.G., and P.P.,
MELISSA SIMMONS and ANGELA KEITH, Appellants,
vs.

BRITTANY SAMPSON and RONAL PERRY, Appellees.

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF
OTTAWA COUNTY, OKLAHOMA

HONORABLE ANDREW R. MELOY, TRIAL JUDGE

AFFIRMED

Jason M. Lile LILE LEGAL SERVICES, PLLC Tulsa, Oklahoma For Appellants

Andrew T. Doney DONEY LAW PLLC Miami, Oklahoma For Appellees

STACIE L. HIXON, CHIEF JUDGE:

¶1 Appellants, Melissa Hockett, co-guardian to two minor children, C.G. and P.P., and her spouse, Angela Keith (Guardians), filed an Application for Adoption of Minor Children Without Consent of Natural Parents on August 26, 2024. ¹ Guardians alleged that the parents had abandoned, failed to support and failed to establish and/or maintain a substantial and positive relationship with the minor children during the twelve consecutive months out of the fourteen months preceding the filing of their application. Brittany Samson (Mother), the mother of the two minor children, and Ronal Perry (Father), the father of P.P., had previously filed a Petition to Terminate the Temporary Guardianship on July 9, 2024.

¶2 The trial court denied Guardians' application, determining that Guardians had not established through clear and convincing evidence that the minor children were eligible for adoption without the consent of parents on the grounds alleged. Guardians now appeal the trial court's Order. Based on our review of the record and applicable law, we affirm the trial court's order of August 11, 2025 in its entirety.

BACKGROUND

¶3 On July 25, 2022, Brenda Markfort filed a Petition for Guardianship of Minor Children, C.G. and P.P., in Ottawa County and was appointed as Special Guardian. On August 22, 2022, Melissa Simmons (now Hockett), filed a Petition for Appointment of Co-Guardian, and the district court appointed Markfort and Hockett as temporary co-guardians. ²

¶4 Mother and Father (collectively "Parents") moved to California for residential drug treatment in November of 2023. Later, Parents were employed by the treatment facility while continuing treatment, saving approximately \$20,000 of their earnings. There was no court order in place specifying child support within the guardianship; however, Guardians, admittedly, refused the offer of Parents to provide money in support of the minor children at the outset of the guardianship, urging Parents to make treatment their priority instead. Accordingly, Parents acknowledged they did not provide monetary support for the children with the exception of sending diapers for P.P. once as well as providing ongoing gifts for the children on Christmas and birthdays throughout the guardianship.

¶5 There was also no court order outlining visitation within the guardianship. Prior to and following their move to California, however, Parents had ongoing in-person and telephone visits with the minor children until June of 2024 at which time the Guardians halted contact with Parents. Parents filed their Petition to Terminate Temporary Guardianship on July 9, 2024.

¶6 On August 26, 2024, Guardian Hockett and Keith filed an Application for Adoption of Minor Children Without Consent of Natural Parents (Application for Adoption) for the adoption of C.G. and P.P. on the following alleged grounds pursuant to 10 O.S.2021, § 7505-4.2: abandonment, failure to support, and failure to establish and/or maintain a substantial and positive relationship with the minor children. The relevant look-back period for consideration by the trial court was twelve (12) consecutive months out of the fourteen (14) months prior to the filing of the Application for Adoption, or June 26, 2023 to August 26, 2024. Parents objected.

¶7 On July 31, 2025, the trial court heard the Application for Adoption. Guardians and Parents were present and represented by counsel. ³ After hearing testimony of Hockett, Keith, Parents and the court-appointed guardian ad litem as well as arguments of legal counsel, the trial court took the matter under advisement. On August 11, 2025, the trial court denied Guardians' Application for Adoption in a detailed Order, finding that Guardians had not met their burden to show through clear and convincing evidence that Parents' consent to the adoption was unnecessary on any of the alleged grounds.

¶8 Guardians now appeal the trial court's Order of August 11, 2025.

STANDARD OF REVIEW

¶9 We review the trial court's denial of a petition for adoption without consent for an abuse of discretion. *In re Adoption of Baby Boy K.B.*, 2011 OK 94, ¶ 7, 264 P.3d 1258. "An abuse of discretion occurs when a trial court exercises its discretion 'to an end or purpose not justified by, and clearly against, reason and evidence. It is discretion employed on untenable grounds or for untenable reasons, or a discretionary act which is manifestly unreasonable.'" *Id.* (citations omitted). "The trial court is in the best position to evaluate credibility of witnesses, and is therefore entitled to deference on issues of fact." *In re the Matter of Adoption of C.D.M.*, 2001 OK 103, ¶ 23, 39 P.3d 802. The Court reviews issues of law *de novo*. See *White v. Adoption of Baby Boy D.*, 2000 OK 44, ¶ 35, 10 P.3d 212.

ANALYSIS

¶10 The dispositive issue on appeal is whether the trial court erred in finding that the two minor children were ineligible for adoption without the consent of Parents. "A parent's fundamental right to the care, custody, companionship and management of his or her child is a right protected by the United States and Oklahoma Constitutions." *Matter of Adoption of M.A.S.*, 2018 OK 1, ¶ 10, 419 P.3d 204. "The law presumes that both biological parents must consent before an adoption of their minor child may be effectuated." *Id.* The Legislature,

however, has prescribed certain adoption situations, found at 10 O.S.2021, § 7505-4.2, where prior parental consent is unnecessary and adoption statutes in derogation of a biological parent's rights must be strictly construed in favor of the biological parent. *In re Adoption of C.M.G.*, 1982 OK 156, ¶ 9, 656 P.2d 262.

I. Abandonment

¶11 Guardians assert on appeal that the trial court erred in concluding that Parents did not abandon their children. The Oklahoma Legislature has set forth specific instances of a natural parent's failure to exercise the rights and obligations of parenthood as sufficient to dispense with the parent's consent to the adoption of his or her child. Pursuant to section 7505--4.2(G), where the natural parent has "abandoned" his or her child, the child may be adopted without the natural parent's consent. The statute, however, does not define "abandoned."

¶12 In the absence of a statutory definition of that term, we must ascribe to statutory language its ordinary meaning, unless a contrary intention plainly appears. *Neer v. State ex rel. Oklahoma Tax Com'n*, 1999 OK 41, ¶ 16, 982 P.2d 1071. See e.g. Black's Law Dictionary (12th ed. 2024) ("In the law of adoption, a natural parent's willful act or course of conduct that implies a conscious disregard of or indifference to a child as if no parental obligation existed.") Further, we find this Court's reasoning in *In re Adoption of O.L.P.*, 2002 OK CIV APP 17, ¶ 17, 41 P.3d 999, persuasive in its consideration of the term "abandonment:"

Given the constitutionally protected nature of the parent-child relationship, but considering the constitutionally permitted severance of the relationship where a parent fails to undertake the duties and obligations of that role, we believe the question of "abandonment" in consentless adoption cases under § 7505--4.2(G) must necessarily include some inquiry into the natural parent's subjective intent, manifested by objective conduct, to exercise the duties and obligations of a parent to his or her child(ren).

¶13 The trial court determined that Guardians failed to demonstrate that Parents intended to abandon their children, i.e., relinquish their duties and obligations, relying on Parents' attempts at contact and visitation during the relevant fourteen-month period, as well as Parents' attempt to terminate the guardianship before the adoption case was filed.

¶14 Guardians and Parents alike testified that there was no court-ordered visitation within the guardianship. Though they did not agree in their testimony at the hearing as to how reliably or frequently Parents visited the children, the fact that the in-person and telephone visits with the children transpired within the statutory period is uncontroverted. So too, is the evidence that Parents gifted the children, though the quantity and/or frequency of gifts was disputed by the parties.

¶15 Further, Parents and Guardians testified that contact between Parents and the two minor children was discontinued by Guardians in June of 2024. Shortly after that time, Parents filed a Petition to Terminate the Temporary Guardianship on July 9, 2024, which was within the relevant look-back period. The trial court found it persuasive that Parents were not abandoning the minors but instead, were seeking legal redress to exercise their duties and obligations as parents.

¶16 Though the parties disputed the frequency of visits or volume of gifts, the trial court is the sole arbiter of credibility here, and of reasonable inferences that may be drawn from the evidence. The trial court's determination that Guardians had not met their burden to show abandonment by clear and convincing evidence is not contrary to evidence and is in accord with applicable law. Thus, the trial court did not abuse its discretion by denying Guardians' Application for Adoption without Consent.

II. Substantial and Positive Relationship

¶17 Guardians allege on appeal that the trial court erred in concluding that parents maintained a substantial and positive relationship with the minor children. Guardians claim that parental consent to the children's adoption was not required pursuant to 10 O.S.2021, § 7505-4.2(H)(1), which states:

Consent to adoption is not required from a parent who fails to establish and/or maintain a substantial and positive relationship with a minor for a period of twelve (12) consecutive months out of the last fourteen (14) months immediately preceding the filing of a petition for adoption of the child.

¶18 Section 7505-4.2(H)(3) provides that "fails to establish and/or maintain a substantial and positive relationship" means that the parent has not maintained frequent and regular contact with the minor through frequent and regular visitation or frequent and regular communication to or with the minor; or has not exercised parental rights and responsibilities. While the statute does not prescribe a set volume or frequency of visits, in *In re Adoption of J.N.K.*, 2000 OK CIV APP 132, ¶ 2, 15 P.3d 521, another division of this Court persuasively found that the level of contact considered necessary to maintain a relationship is much less than the minimum visitation to which a noncustodial parent is entitled. A single visit, or sending cards and letters on holidays, may be enough. *Id.* What is more, communications may substitute for actual visitation pursuant to the statute. *Id.* at ¶ 3.

¶19 Here, the relevant fourteen-month look-back period, from which the twelve consecutive months is derived, runs from the filing of Guardians' application on August 26, 2024, back to June 26, 2023. Guardians argue on appeal that the level of visitation, in-person or telephone, by Parents with the children was sporadic at best during that time, thus not rising to a level considered to be substantial. What is more, Guardians contend that the visits between Parents and children were not positive, testifying that C.G. would act out following the visits or show disappointment following unfulfilled promises. ⁴ Further, Guardians argue in their brief-in-chief that the voluntary extended absence by Parents in choosing to move to California in late 2023 "rendered frequent visitation or communication effectively impossible."

¶20 Additional testimony at the hearing on the Application to Adopt, however, was offered that Parents saw the children multiple times before leaving for California to undergo treatment for substance abuse in November of 2023; that Parents continued to reach out to children by telephone to visit once they were in California; and that Parents visited C.G. in person in June of 2024 at a rodeo. ⁵ Though Guardians claimed not every visit was positive, they admitted that some went well. They also provided few specifics as to how Parents' interactions with the children were not positive, apart from their general claims that Parents did not always keep promises.

¶21 Our analysis does not end here, however, as the uncontroverted evidence also reveals that Guardians denied Parents contact with the minor children beginning in June of 2024. The law provides a defense in instances where parents are denied the opportunity to establish and/or maintain a substantial and positive relationship with their minor children. In order that parents avail themselves of the defense, however, section 7505-4.2(H)(2) mandates that when a natural parent claims that he or she "had been denied the opportunity to establish and/or maintain a substantial and positive relationship with the minor by the custodian of the minor," then the parent must show "the court that he or she has taken sufficient legal action to establish and/or maintain a substantial and positive relationship with the minor."

¶22 Adoption statutes are strictly construed. *Matter of Adoption of G.D.L.*, 1987 OK 115, ¶ 13, 747 P.2d 282. "Sufficient legal action" is not defined by the adoption statute. A construction is not required, however, if the statute is unambiguous, and its terms will be given the meaning of its plain language. See *Wylie v. Chesser*, 2007 OK 81, ¶ 19, 173 P.3d 64. "Legal action," though not defined, is a term of art generally understood to mean commencement of formal legal action.

¶23 Though not expressly defined, the Oklahoma Supreme Court has considered when legal action is sufficient which provides some parameters for the application of the term. See e.g. *Matter of Adoption of M.A.S.*, 2018 OK 1, 419 P.3d 204 (father exercised visitation until mother obtained ex parte no contact order; father's motion to modify custody and motion to enforce visitation were sufficient); but see *In re Adoption of G.D.J.*, 2011 OK 77, 261 P.3d 1159 (existence of or parent's participation in grandparents' custody action did not demonstrate parent took sufficient legal action against denial of the opportunity to maintain substantial and positive relationship). The Court considers whether the parent took sufficient legal action against denial of the opportunity to maintain a substantial and positive relationship on a case-by-case basis. See *Matter of Adoption of L.B.L.*, 2023 OK 48, 529 P.3d 175 (as corrected (May 3, 2023)). Further, the fact the parent has filed legal action, even if directed toward establishing that

relationship, does not automatically preclude a finding that the parent failed to maintain a substantial and positive relationship. *Id.* at ¶ 24. If the parent's actions or choices harmed the child, requiring a prohibition of contact, then the parent's filing of legal action may not be a defense to a custodian's assertion that the parent has failed to maintain a substantial, positive relationship with the child. The Court explained that if "the *actual* contacts between a [parent] and child are neither substantial nor positive," the court will not find a custodian's denial of visitation denied the opportunity for a substantial and positive relationship. *Id.* ⁶

¶24 In this case, Guardians stopped all contact with Parents in June of 2024. However, as addressed above, Parents had had a number of contacts with the children leading up to that time, including visits and sending gifts. Guardians explained that in June 2024, they decided to follow the guardianship order in place since 2022, which they had not strictly followed previously, and which did not grant visitation to Parents. ⁷ Though Guardians did contend that Parents' interactions were not positive, as addressed above, the evidence at trial was conflicting. Further, on this issue, Guardians argue only that Parents' filing to terminate the guardianship was "unsupportable" and "should hardly be considered 'sufficient legal action to establish and/or maintain a substantial and positive relationship,'" and reason that Parents should have instead filed to establish or enforce visitation rather than "prematurely" filing to terminate the guardianship.

¶25 While Guardians might have had a preference that Parents establish or enforce visitation within the guardianship action rather than filing to terminate the guardianship, nowhere do we find support for their proposition in prevailing case law or statutory provisions that filing to terminate does not meet the threshold of "sufficient legal action." By its very nature, filing to terminate and re-acquire custody of the children is a means to address Guardians' purported denial of Parents' maintenance of a substantial, positive relationship with children and meets the definition of sufficient legal action. Further, the record as a whole supports a determination that Parents had attempted to maintain a substantial and positive relationship with the children until visitation was terminated and the trial court could consider their pursuit of legal action as a defense to their alleged failure to maintain a substantial and positive relationship.

¶26 The trial court explained in its Order that even if the visits and gifts from Parents to the minor children were insufficient to establish and/or maintain a substantial and positive relationship with C.G. and P.P., Parents also took sufficient legal action following Guardians' interference with their ability to contact the children. Under the facts of record, the trial court's determination that Guardians had not met their burden to show Parents' failure to establish and/or maintain a substantial and positive relationship by clear and convincing evidence is not contrary to the evidence and is in accord with applicable law. Thus, the trial court did not abuse its discretion by denying Guardians' Application for Adoption without consent.

III. Willful Failure to Support

¶27 Guardians also contend on appeal that the trial court erred in finding no willful failure to support the minor children per section 7505-4.2 (B), which reads, in relevant part:

B. Consent to adoption is not required from a parent who, for a period of twelve (12) consecutive months out of the last fourteen (14) months immediately preceding the filing of a petition for adoption of a child or a petition to terminate parental rights pursuant to Section 7505-2.1 of this title, has willfully failed, refused, or neglected to contribute to the support of such minor:

1. In substantial compliance with an order entered by a court of competent jurisdiction adjudicating the duty, amount, and manner of support; or
2. According to such parent's financial ability to contribute to such minor's support if no provision for support is provided in an order. For the purposes of this section, support for the minor shall benefit the minor by providing a necessity. . . .

¶28 In accordance with the statute, because there was no support order entered in this guardianship case, Guardians were required to demonstrate by clear and convincing evidence that Parents willfully failed, refused or neglected to provide support to the children according to their financial ability. Whether Parents failed to provide support in accordance with their financial ability, as well as whether that failure was willful, were questions of fact to be determined by the trial court.

¶29 Based on the facts in the matter before us, we conclude the trial court's determination that Parents' alleged failure to provide financial support for C.G. and P.P. while in the care of Guardians during the statutorily-prescribed period was not willful within the meaning of section 7505-4.2(B) was adequately supported. The district court in the guardianship proceeding did not order Parents to provide support for the minor children to Guardians, nor did Guardians request support from Parents at any time. The evidence reflects that Parents offered to provide support for the minor children but that Guardians refused their offer, advising Parents that treatment needed to be their priority and assuring them that they did not need anything for support of the children.

¶30 Guardians contend, however, on appeal that the evidence of Parents' substantial savings and extended absence from the children while residing in California negated Parents' intent to provide support for the children.⁸ The evidence, however, does not provide clear and convincing support for Guardians' contention. There is no clear indication that Parents incapacitated themselves for the purpose of avoiding child support. "A parent who is financially unable to provide for the support of his child and who has not voluntarily placed himself in a disabling position to avoid legal responsibility is not within the class of persons whose power to consent is judicially extinguishable." *Matter of Adoption of J.L.H.*, 1987 OK 25, ¶ 14, 737 P.2d 915. Instead, Parents moved to California seeking treatment for substance abuse, a purpose for which Guardians voiced support.

¶31 Further, the trial court found it persuasive that Parents filed to terminate the temporary guardianship. Parents also testified about their intentions to reassert their custody of and care for the children. Specifically, Parents testified that they were saving their earnings for the intended purposes of returning home and establishing housing and furnishings for the care of the children. Father testified that he was furthering his training as a drug addiction therapist in order to establish gainful employment when he returned home to support the family. Mother also testified that she would be able to continue in her current employment, working remotely for the treatment facility, when she returned to care for the children.

¶32 While Parents did not pay child support, the evidence does not demonstrate their failure to support was willful. The trial court's determination that Guardians had not met their burden to show Parents' willful failure to support the minor children by clear and convincing evidence is not contrary to evidence and is in accord with applicable law. Thus, the trial court did not abuse its discretion by denying Guardians' Application for Adoption without consent.

IV: Failure to Apply Clear and Convincing Evidence Standard

¶33 Guardians assert on appeal that the trial court erred in its application of the clear and convincing evidentiary standard, ignoring uncontroverted evidence and/or improperly weighing evidence in reaching its decision that the minor children were not eligible for adoption without parental consent.

¶34 "A party requesting a court order allowing an adoption without consent must prove by clear and convincing evidence that one or more of the statutory criteria have been met." *Matter of Adoption of N.J.B.*, 2025 OK 8, ¶ 14, 564 P.3d 75. "Clear and convincing evidence is that measure or degree of proof which will produce in the mind of the trier of fact a firm belief or conviction as to the truth of the allegation sought to be established." *Id.* However, in an adoption proceeding, the decision of the trial court need not rest on uncontradicted evidence. "The trial court is in the best position to evaluate credibility of witnesses, and is therefore entitled to deference on issues of fact." *In re Adoption of C.D.M.*, 2001 OK 103, ¶ 23, 39 P.3d 802. "Credibility of witnesses and the effect and weight of conflicting or inconsistent testimony are questions of fact to be determined by the trier of fact, and are not questions of law for the court on appeal." *Steltzlen v. Fritz*, 2006 OK 20, ¶ 18, 134 P.3d 141.

¶35 The trial court carefully outlined its findings from the evidence upon which it based its decision that the minor children were ineligible to be adopted without the consent of the natural parents. Guardians, however, argue that the trial court essentially should have concluded from much of this same evidence that Parents had abandoned their children; had failed to establish and/or maintain a substantial and positive relationship with the children; and had willfully failed to support them. However, as addressed above, evidence which Guardians contend was not enough contact or support or inadequate to maintain a positive and substantial relationship was subject to more than one interpretation.

¶36 Additionally, Parents' testimony that they attempted to contact the children but were blocked by Guardians; that they offered to provide support, but Guardians refused the support; and that they sent gifts, if believed, lends support for the trial court's interpretation of the evidence.

¶37 Further, the trial court also considered and weighed the testimony provided by the court-appointed guardian ad litem at the time of the hearing. After interviewing the parties involved and reviewing the case, the guardian ad litem submitted his Preliminary Report to the trial court for review. He testified that Parents appeared sincere in their efforts to be a part of the children's lives as evidenced by their own sobriety and their service in working for the treatment center to help others with sobriety. Moreover, the guardian ad litem expressed that he had no safety concerns at that time about Parents interacting with C.G. and P.P., describing Parents as "pretty solid." He also recommended at the hearing that it was in the best interests of the minor children to leave the guardianship in place for now and to award regular visitation to Parents ". . . to get the biological parents kind of reintegrated into their life with the guardians." Overall, not only did the guardian ad litem's testimony suggest it was not in the best interest of the children to grant the adoption, but to the point here, it lent support to the court's conclusion that Parents did not intend to abandon their children or to willfully withhold support while they were pursuing treatment.

¶38 After reviewing the record, we do not find that the trial court failed to apply the correct evidentiary standard. Rather, we find the trial court did not abuse its discretion when it concluded Guardians failed to meet their burden to show the children were eligible for adoption without consent.

CONCLUSION

¶39 For the foregoing reasons, we affirm the trial court's Order of August 11, 2025, in its entirety.

¶40 AFFIRMED.

WISEMAN, P.J., and FISCHER, J., concur.

FOOTNOTES

STACIE L. HIXON, CHIEF JUDGE:

¹ For ease of reference, we refer to Hockett and Keith, the current caretakers of the children, as "Guardians." However, Hockett and Brenda Markfort were co-guardians. Hockett moved to adopt the children along with Keith. Markfort is not a party to this appeal.

² The record provides little detail as to the exact circumstances prompting the initiation of the guardianship by co-guardians, Brenda Markfort, Mother's grandmother, and Melissa Hockett, Mother's distant cousin. Following the establishment of the guardianship, the minor children lived with Hockett and Keith at all times relevant to this matter.

³ The alleged father of C.G. was not present at the hearing. The trial court stated in its Order that his consent to the adoption was not necessary because he failed to appear for the hearing after having been properly served.

⁴ Guardians also assert in their brief-in-chief that Mother was verbally abusive toward them "rendering telephonic contact nearly impossible." This assertion, however, stands in contrast to the testimony offered at the hearing. Guardian testified that Mother had cussed her out on the phone "a couple of times" outside of the presence of the children when Mother was not sober.

⁵ It is unclear whether P.P. was also present. Mother also testified that she had seen P.P. on Easter of 2024.

⁶ In *L.B.L.*, mother was denied visitation with the child upon advice of the child's therapist. Mother filed a petition for visitation and relied on this legal action as a defense to the guardian's claim that mother had failed to maintain a substantial and positive relationship with the child. The record reflected denial of visitation was in the child's best interest. Further, mother did nothing else to foster a positive relationship with the child, such as sending letters, cards, books or toys; contacting the child's therapist, as directed; or contacting the guardians to explore other avenues of communication. During the relevant period, her only contact was a birthday package. *Id.* at

¶ 23. The record showed that the guardians did not prevent mother from making any attempt at establishing a relationship, other than refusing visitation for safety reasons. *Id.* at ¶ 23. The Court found that a parent "may be prevented from raising this defense to an adoption without consent if her actions or choices harm the child, resulting in an official recommendation or even prohibition against contact." *Id.* at ¶ 24. Under the facts in *L.B.L.*, the Court found, notwithstanding the denial of visitation and Mother's petition for visitation, the guardians had demonstrated that mother failed to establish and/or maintain a substantial, positive relationship with the child.

⁷ Mother's testimony, however, was that the court did not explicitly bar visitation between the children and Parents, but instead expected Parents and Guardians to come to an agreement as to a visitation schedule and to communicate accordingly.

⁸ Guardians' counsel implied in his closing arguments to the trial court that Parents chose to seek treatment in California rather than closer to home to avoid parental responsibilities.

Citationizer® Summary of Documents Citing This Document

Cite	Name	Level
------	------	-------

None Found.

Citationizer: Table of Authority

Cite Name**Level****Oklahoma Court of Civil Appeals Cases**

Cite	Name	Level
<u>2000 OK CIV APP 132, 15 P.3d 521, 71 OBJ 3306,</u>	<u>IN RE ADOPTION OF J.N.K.</u>	Discussed
<u>2002 OK CIV APP 17, 41 P.3d 999, 73 OBJ 592,</u>	<u>IN THE MATTER OF THE ADOPTION OF O.L.P.</u>	Discussed

Oklahoma Supreme Court Cases

Cite	Name	Level
<u>1987 OK 25, 737 P.2d 915, 57 OBJ 675,</u>	<u>Adoption of J.L.H., Matter of</u>	Discussed
<u>1987 OK 115, 747 P.2d 282, 58 OBJ 3300,</u>	<u>Adoption of G.D.L., Matter of</u>	Discussed
<u>2001 OK 103, 39 P.3d 802, 72 OBJ 3648,</u>	<u>IN RE ADOPTION OF C.D.M.</u>	Discussed at Length
<u>2006 OK 20, 134 P.3d 141,</u>	<u>STELTZLEN v. FRITZ</u>	Discussed
<u>2007 OK 81, 173 P.3d 64,</u>	<u>WYLIE v. CHESSER</u>	Discussed
<u>2011 OK 77, 261 P.3d 1159,</u>	<u>IN THE MATTER OF THE ADOPTION OF G.D.J.</u>	Discussed
<u>2011 OK 94, 264 P.3d 1258,</u>	<u>IN THE MATTER OF THE ADOPTION OF BABY BOY K.B.</u>	Discussed
<u>2018 OK 1, 419 P.3d 204,</u>	<u>IN THE MATTER OF THE ADOPTION OF M.A.S.</u>	Discussed at Length
<u>2000 OK 44, 10 P.3d 212, 71 OBJ 1583,</u>	<u>WHITE v. ADOPTION OF BABY BOY D.</u>	Discussed
<u>2023 OK 48, 529 P.3d 175,</u>	<u>IN THE MATTER OF THE ADOPTION OF L.B.L.</u>	Discussed
<u>1982 OK 156, 656 P.2d 262,</u>	<u>Adoption of C.M.G., Matter of</u>	Discussed
<u>2025 OK 8, 564 P.3d 75,</u>	<u>IN THE MATTER OF THE ADOPTION OF N.J.B.</u>	Discussed
<u>1999 OK 41, 982 P.2d 1071, 70 OBJ 1551,</u>	<u>Neer v. State ex rel. Oklahoma Tax Commission</u>	Discussed

Title 10. Children

Cite	Name	Level
<u>10 O.S. 7505-4.2,</u>	<u>Parental Consent Exception</u>	Discussed at Length