

NON-PRECEDENTIAL DECISION - SEE SUPERIOR COURT O.P. 65.37

IN THE INTEREST OF: B.B., A MINOR	:	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF
	:	PENNSYLVANIA
	:	
APPEAL OF: B.B., A MINOR	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	No. 60 WDA 2026

Appeal from the Dispositional Order Entered December 15, 2025
In the Court of Common Pleas of Washington County Juvenile Division at
No(s): CP-63-JV-0000094-2024

IN THE INTEREST OF: B.B., A MINOR	:	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF
	:	PENNSYLVANIA
	:	
APPEAL OF: B.B., A MINOR	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	
	:	No. 61 WDA 2026

Appeal from the Dispositional Order Entered December 15, 2025
In the Court of Common Pleas of Washington County Juvenile Division at
No(s): CP-63-JV-0000040-2024

BEFORE: SULLIVAN, J., NEUMAN, J., and STEVENS, P.J.E.*

MEMORANDUM BY STEVENS, P.J.E.:

FILED: August 21, 2026

B.B., a minor, appeals from the Dispositional Orders entered in the Court of Common Pleas of Washington County, Juvenile Division, that placed him in a residential treatment facility. After careful consideration, we affirm.

* Former Justice specially assigned to the Superior Court.

The juvenile court provides the pertinent facts and case history transpiring over the course of several dispositional reviews and culminating with its Dispositional Order of December 15, 2025, by which it determined that placement of B.B. in an out-of-home residential treatment facility was the least restrictive means of placement that would be consistent with the protection of the community and the best option for his rehabilitation, supervision, and treatment.

By order dated April 22, 2024, [then-13 year old B.B.] was adjudicated delinquent on the charges of Disorderly Conduct (M3) and Terroristic Threats (M1). *See: Adjudication Order of April 22, 2024.*^{Fn1} A Youth Level Assessment was completed prior to disposition, which assessed B.B. at an 18, a moderate risk level. *Id. at 4.* At the time of adjudication, and consistent with B.B.'s treatment, supervision, rehabilitation, and welfare, he was placed on indefinite probation, removed from the home of his parents, and placed at a residential facility.

Fn1 The written allegations substantiating the charges indicate that [B.B.] threatened a bus aide [by] making statement of "firearms and weapons." In addition, the affidavit indicates that [B.B.] was caught with a live ammunition round at the school and was overheard talking to another student on the bus about firearms. At the close of conversation, [B.B.] "makes the statement of, "imagine putting that to someone's head – you'll see the inside and out[,] and "Hey, Ms. Cheryl do you want to see the inside of your head? If you want to, I can help you out; I'll even take you to the doctor."

On May 17, 2024, a dispositional review hearing was conducted. As part of the dispositional review, a diagnostic evaluation was ordered at KidsPeace. *Id.* All other previously ordered conditions remained.

The next dispositional review hearing was conducted on July 25, 2024. [B.B.] was found to be compliant with the previous order and meeting the terms and conditions previously imposed. See: Permanency Review Order of July 25, 2024, time-stamped August 6, 2024. The review order indicates that B.B. was evaluated in the KidsPeace inpatient diagnostic program. Following results of the KidsPeace evaluation, as recommended by juvenile probation, B.B. was released from KidsPeace and returned to the care of his mother.

Following the dispositional review hearing on January 23, 2025, B.B. was found compliant with the [juvenile court's] orders. The [juvenile court] order notes that B.B. was compliant with Pressley Ridge-Crisis Stabilization Family Preservation and completed "Thinking Trap Bit." See: Permanency Review Order of January 23, 2025. In addition, the Order notes that B.B. is still working on complying with school rules, displaying appropriate behaviors, complying with medication management and complying with [Multi-specialized therapy, hereinafter, "MST."] *Id.* B.B. was noted to continue to have "disruptive and disrespectful behaviors towards staff and peers at school." ^{Fn2} B.B.'s school behaviors were noted as "inconsistent" with positive reports of having no "behavioral infractions reported in the school since December 17, 2024. Additionally, B.B. was noted to be compliant with his medication management, attending MST, and testing negative for all substances. The case was anticipated for closure on and/or before the next review with a state goal of B.B. controlling his "impulsivity" and completing requested services.

Fn2 B.B. was attending Transformational Learning Center at the time of the review hearing.

On May 6, 2025, a review hearing was conducted finding B.B. compliant with his probation and services. Despite such finding, the Dispositional Review Order indicates that:^{Fn 3}

Fn3 See: May 6, 2025, Dispositional Review Order.

The Juvenile Probation Office has utilized graduated responses since the last review hearing:

January 28, 2025: BIT (Overcoming Automatic responses Sanction for disrespectful/poor school behavior

February 13, 2025: Sanction at LEADER (1 Day) for stealing Mother's perfume.

April 9, 2025 – April 11, 2025: 3-Day LEADER Sanction for disrespectful/poor school behavior.

April 25, 2025 – April 30, 2025: 3 Day LEADER Sanction for disrespectful/poor school behavior; police contact; aggressive/assaultive behavior with his peers.

On April 3, 2025, [B.B.] received an incentive for good and consistent behavior in the school setting.

Most of [B.B.'s] concerning behaviors occur in the school setting; however, the incident which involved police contact occurred in the community. On April 21, 2025, Juvenile Probation received a phone call from Charleroi Police regarding [B.B.] It was alleged that [B.B.] had assaulted both of his younger siblings. It was further stated that neither of [B.B.'s] younger siblings had marks on their person. [B.B.] was allegedly upset regarding having to attend school. [B.B.] attempted to jump out of a moving car; his sibling grabbed him. [B.B.] then slapped his younger siblings. [F.F.] was noted to have shown remorse. Mr. Taddy noted that Charleroi Police have indicated that they were not going to pursue charges.

[B.B.] has also stolen \$5.00 from a tip jar from a café; and allegedly stole a door dash order from McDonalds.

There are no pending charges from these alleged incidents.

[B.B.] is inconsistent with schooling. [B.B.] has good days and bad days in the school setting. In the past week, [B.B.] has been doing better in school and has been receiving better school reports [B.B.] has had fourteen (14) behavioral infractions in the school since his last Dispositional Review Hearing on January 23, 2025. Mr. Taddy testified that some of the behavioral infractions are more than one (1) in a single day. [B.B.] could incur three (3) behavioral infractions on the same day. These behavioral infractions took place between January 28 [and] April 1, 2025.

[B.B.] is noted to be compliant with mental health treatment and MST Therapy with Mr. Cutlip. [B.B.] is compliant with medication management through Healing Bridges. . . .

Juvenile Court's Dispositional Review Order, 12/15/2025, 1-4.

After B.B. was released from KidsPeace on July 25, 2025, he was put on a waiting list for a hospitalization program to accommodate his educational needs. In the interim, however, he was placed in detention on August 18, 2025, after a violation of probation hearing led to the court's determination that on two occasions he had left his mother's home without the permission of the probation officer.

On September 18, 2025, B.B. was admitted to the partial hospitalization program at Transformation Learning Center. On October 22, 2025, however, he was placed in detention for once again violating the terms of his probation by leaving his home for hours at a time without permission, while wearing an ankle monitor. On October 30, 2025, a hearing ended with a court order that

B.B. was to participate in a 29-day sanction at "Outside-In," which B.B. completed but with negative comments by supervisors. Accordingly, Washington County Juvenile Probation recommended long-term, out-of-home placement.

The juvenile court considered juvenile probation's recommendation at two hearings occurring on December 1, 2025, and December 15, 2025. At the conclusion of B.B.'s final Dispositional Review Hearing of December 15, 2025, the Juvenile Court made the following observations in support of choosing out-of-home placement:

Juvenile Court: All right. I'm going to go with the recommendation that has been made by juvenile probation, [B.B.], today. So, it will allow for you to go into the Abraxas Specialized Treatment Program. And in the meantime, you will be moved to the Abraxas shelter program.

. . .

We will keep him in indefinite probation during that time. And the only difference in terms of why I'm making the decision to allow him to try this new program is because of the consistent periods of time where he absconded while on the ankle monitor. And I am looking at the history here, starting back in 2024 with his first adjudication and placement, there were problems in terms of his compliance. He was released and sent to KidsPeace for his diagnostic and then continued on indefinite probation in July of 2024 and in January 2025 and May of 2025 and June of 2025. And after that period of time, there was still activity – failed to comply with the requirements of probation, including the actions and activities in October of 2025.

So, frankly, he's been given a lot of chances, Ms. Lester [public defender]. And while I'd like to give him another chance while we look at this diagnosis to see, I'm concerned that the activity – I mean, there's a lot of activity in a short period of time. The message isn't getting through despite the services – including the

two additional violations of probation. And he's received positive feedback and had received incentives and despite that, right after, would violate.

So, hopefully, this will be a program that we can address while he's just freshly newly-minted 16. So, with a six-month program, he would be able to start the new school year back in a more traditional learning environment if he's able to have some behavioral and educational adjustments.

In addition, I want to make sure his medication management is taken care of so that hopefully he can return to Mother's house by summer and she will have a medication management plan for him.

All right. So, I'm going to continue indefinite probation, order him to abide by the terms and conditions of probation to be removed from [his current residence] with his mother [], be placed at the Abraxas Shelter Care Program, effective December 17th, with transportation provided by the facility.

Pending his transfer to Abraxas specialized treatment program in January of 2026, should a bed not be available by the end of January 2026, this matter should be immediately referred back to this Court for additional actions. Inasmuch as the [juvenile court] is taking this action, seeing it as the least restrictive alternative with the services that have been represented to the [juvenile court] that would be made available within that 30-day period of time.

He would be on indefinite, concurrent probation under the care, custody, and supervision of Washington County Juvenile Probation. At this time, I would make the determination that a return home is contrary to his best interest and welfare and reasonable efforts have been made to prevent the need for placement outside of the home with the listing of services that have been provided over the nearly one-and-a-half year history with Washington County Juvenile Detention Center, pending his transfer to the shelter facility.

He'll be required to abide by the rules and regulations of the placement facility, his home in the community, and to ensure the stability and the appropriateness of his education, he will not return to the Transformational but will instead . . . be attending

classes on the grounds of Abraxas shelter and Abraxas Specialized Training Program.

It should be specifically noted in the order that it has been represented this is a six-month program but the ultimate goal is to have [B.B.] return into the home of [his mother] following that six-month period and hopefully returning to the home prior to the next school year.

He will be required to submit to the mental health assessment and psychiatric evaluation and psychological evaluation. And medical management, as represented, can be provided directly through Abraxas treatment program.

He will pay the fees that were previously ordered, have a review hearing within 90 days , that being on March 12, 2026, at 10:30 before the Hearing Officer. He will be required to comply with all the conditions of probation that he has reviewed with his counsel.

. . .

N.T., 12/15/25, at 36, 37-40.

B.B. timely filed an appeal and presents the following question for this Court's consideration:

Should B.B. be granted a review hearing to re-evaluate the appropriateness of the disposition ordered on December 15, 2025, based on the findings that were incongruent with the evidence presented and the procedural requirements that were omitted during his violation of probation hearing on that date?

Brief of Appellant, at 8.

B.B. contends the juvenile court entered its December 15, 2025, dispositional order based on findings of fact that lack support in the record and only after it failed to adhere to procedures required of a violation of juvenile probation hearing. Specifically, he argues that the court failed to provide reasons establishing that out-of-home placement represented the least restrictive disposition that was both consistent with the protection of the

public and best suited to his rehabilitative needs. Moreover, he alleges there was no discussion in open court about whether he had received adequate educational services under Rule 148, such as evaluations, tests, counseling, or treatments, which he maintains amounts to an abuse of discretion that require this Court to vacate the dispositional order.

“The Juvenile Act grants juvenile courts broad discretion when determining an appropriate disposition.” ***In re C.A.G.***, 89 A.3d 704, 709 (Pa. Super. 2014). On review, this Court will not disturb a sentence in a juvenile delinquency proceeding absent a manifest abuse of discretion or a clear error law. ***See In re L.A.***, 853 A. 2d 388, 394 (Pa. Super. 2004).

Section 6352(a) of the Juvenile Act mandates that a juvenile court's disposition must “be consistent with the protection of the public interest and best suited to the child's treatment, supervision, rehabilitation and welfare[.]” 42 Pa.C.S.A. § 6352(a). The juvenile court must “provide balanced attention to the protection of the community, the imposition of accountability for offenses committed and the development of competencies to enable the child to become a responsible and productive member of the community.” ***Id.***

Section 6301 of the Juvenile Act specifies that a child should be separated from a parent or guardian “only when necessary for his [or her] welfare, safety or health or in the interests of public safety [.]” 42 Pa.C.S.A. § 6301(b)(3). The Juvenile Act requires the juvenile court to employ “the least restrictive intervention that is consistent with the protection of the

community, the imposition of accountability for offenses committed and the rehabilitation, supervision and treatment needs of the child.” 42 Pa.C.S.A. § 6301(b)(3)(i).

A juvenile receives a proper dispositional hearing where, “at hearing, the court considers reports of the probation officer, the Youth Center, and the psychological and psychiatric evaluations which satisfies the due process requirements of 42 Pa.C.S.A. § 6301(b)(4).” ***In re Love***, 646 A.2d 1233, 1238 (Pa. Super. 1994).

Further, the Pennsylvania Rules of Juvenile Court Procedure specify the form and content of dispositional hearings and court orders. **See generally** Pa.R.J.C.P. 512. The court's findings and conclusions of law must be entered into the record. **See** Pa.R.J.C.P. 512(D). The court must also state on the record in open court:

- (1) its disposition;
- (2) the reasons for its disposition;
- (3) the terms, conditions, and limitations of the disposition; and
- (4) if the juvenile is removed from the home:
 - (a) the name or type of any agency or institution that shall provide care, treatment, supervision, or rehabilitation of the juvenile;
 - (b) its findings and conclusions of law that formed the basis of its decision consistent with 42 Pa.C.S.A. §§ 6301, 6352, including why the court found that the out of home placement ordered is the least restrictive type of placement that is consistent with the protection of the public and best suited to the

juvenile's treatment, supervision, rehabilitation, and welfare.

(c) the provision of educational services for the juvenile pursuant to Rule 148;

(5) whether any evaluations, tests, counseling, or treatments are necessary;

(6) any findings necessary to ensure the stability and appropriateness of the juvenile's education, and when appropriate, the court shall appoint an educational decision maker pursuant to Rule 147; and

(7) any findings necessary to identify, monitor, and address the juvenile's needs concerning health care and disability, if any, and if parental consent cannot be obtained, authorize evaluations and treatment needed.

Id.

We address B.B.'s contention that the juvenile court failed to comply with statutorily required procedures during the juvenile probation hearing. A review of the record shows that B.B. offered no timely and specific objection asserting a perceived procedural error or failure of the juvenile court to comport with procedures mandated by the juvenile code. "In order to preserve a claim for appellate review, a party must make a timely and specific objection at the appropriate stage of the proceedings before the trial court, or the claim is waived." ***Int. of K.G.-B.***, 354 A.3d 1, 14 (Pa. Super. 2026) (citing ***Commonwealth v. Russell***, 209 A.3d 419, 429 (Pa. Super. 2019); ***see also*** Pa.R.A.P. 302(a)). Accordingly, B.B. has waived his procedural-based issue raised herein.

B.B.'s remaining issue contends that the juvenile court abused its discretion in adjudicating him delinquent and removing him from his home because it failed to state adequately on the record its findings of fact and conclusions of law that supported its decision that a less restrictive alternative placement was inappropriate. We find no merit to this claim.

The notes of testimony from the review hearing of December 1, 2025, include the testimony of Dr. Katya Lebedev, a child adolescent psychiatrist who discussed the opportunities she had to meet with B.B. at his intake and initial psychiatric evaluation on September 18, 2025, at his follow-up visit on October 17, and briefly when he was in the "partial group" room. N.T., 12/1/25, at 61. She explained that she diagnosed him with ADHD, combined type and dysregulated – or disruptive mood disorder, and she also included a few "rule-out diagnoses," including autism spectrum disorder, conduct disorder, and a history of prediabetes. Dr. Lebedev recommended ADOS testing to evaluate for autism spectrum disorder when she saw B.B. again on October 17, 2025.

When asked her opinion on Juvenile Probation's recommendation of long-term placement, Dr. Lebedev responded, "My opinion is that I understand why that would be the recommendation regarding his delinquent behavior in the past, but it is not inline with my medical recommendation." N.T. at 64. She recommended, instead, that B.B. continue with school-based partial program, namely, her group's specific program at Transformations Learning through Centerville Clinics with the support of MST. N.T. at 64-65.

Dr. Lebedev opined that with B.B.'s rule-out diagnoses of reactive attachment disorder and disinhibited social engagement disorder came the argument, in her opinion, that long-term placement outside the home was not the best option for him, as the opportunity to form stronger attachments with both peers and adult authority figures could only help him even if the rule-out diagnoses are eventually confirmed. N.T. at 65.

On cross-examination, Dr. Lebedev was asked if she knew of B.B.'s history of delinquency and treatment and rehabilitation through the juvenile justice system, and she answered that she knew he had a history of multiple placements and has a probation officer assigned to him. In particular, she opined that B.B.'s history of receiving MST services in Washington County was noteworthy because "it's really, really hard to get kids MST services in Washington County[,]" so she inferred that he must have reached a significant level of delinquency to qualify for such services, and she agreed that it was significant to her that "Juvenile Probation has been successful in getting MST services for [B.B.]" N.T. at 67. She continued,

Dr. Lebedev: You know, typically, MST – in my profession, MST is really the same level of service as a residential treatment facility or institutional placement. And, if at all possible, as a child psychiatrist, I would always recommend the less – least restrictive option, which is MST. But the fact that he was able to get that organized, or get set up for himself, I mean, it – it shows that his probation officer had concerns about him being in the community without that level of support.

N.T. at 68.

At the conclusion of the December 1, 2025, hearing, the juvenile court indicated that it was concerned that it did not have enough information at that time to make a determination. N.T. at 73. The court was hesitant to act on the Commonwealth's recommendation for placement in George Junior Republic, though it acknowledged that school has positive, successful outcomes, because "there are questions that remain unanswered with regard to the mental health and other educational diagnoses and the requirements that they would have through the George Junior program." *Id.*

The juvenile court observed that because it had not seen any significant change in B.B.'s behaviors, it was still unsure as to why that was so and what would enable it to discover "what the best thing is for [B.B.]" *Id.* Because B.B. was now in his "second chance" phase, the trial court expressed reluctance about simply "just doing the MST services and working with the partial program and not . . . seeing improvement because what's going to happen is that, if he continues to have those behaviors, obviously, he's beyond his second chance. . . . And it would be a much more severe type of placement program. . . ." N.T. at 74.

The juvenile court acknowledged that it required additional testimonies from those involved in the "safety, security, and protective" aspects of B.B.'s case with particular inquiries into "at-home services to address any of the concerns that have been part of this history and, obviously, some of the reasons for the sanctions and the additional services. So, hopefully, we'll have a more comprehensive understanding at the time." N.T. at 77.

On December 15, 2025, the juvenile court reconvened the parties and received testimony on autism counseling and services that are available in Abraxas. Testimony of Washington County Juvenile Probation Officer Julian Pintola confirmed that there are specialized services and a treatment program for autism there. N.T., 12/15/25, at 8. P.O. Pintola testified that B.B. would receive at Abraxas an education that would accommodate his special needs associated with autism, as he would receive daily opportunities for one-on-one educational experiences with specialists. NT. at 9. They were just waiting on beds. N.T. at 11. The STP program would provide the specialized services and treatments for autism.

B.B.'s mother testified that she just took B.B. to autism diagnostics. N.T. at 12. That included parent evaluation. She also said B.B. was diagnosed with intellectual disability/mental retardation after his physician, Dr. Carosso with the Greensburg autism with a 69 IQ. His IEP is based on an 84 IQ, but with a downward change in score to 69, he would qualify as intellectually disabled.

According to Mother, Dr. Carosso says B.B. has ADHD and mood disorder, is bipolar, and is awaiting more information on where on the spectrum of autism he resides. She explains that their doctor must review additional educational records before making a final assessment. N.T., 12/15/25, at 14-15. She testifies that B.B. has not restarted ADHD meds. Ant that B.B.'s doctor is willing to take him as a patient and to work collaboratively with the school. N.T. at 16.

The public defender argued that B.B. should be returned to the community and given the opportunity to begin this new phase of treatment based on a new diagnosis of autism and intellectual disability. He was just admitted into this partial program in September 2025, counsel observed, and she argued that to remove him just three months into the program would be traumatic and disruptive of a routine that he needs now with the autism diagnosis. N.T. at 16-17. She acknowledged the safety concern with leaving him on a GPS monitor, N.T. at 17, but she asked the juvenile court for one more chance given the new information on autism and IQ and the new services that would be available. N.T. at 17.

The Commonwealth argued that many services had been in place to help B.B., but he continues to present safety concerns, to act out, and to “abscond” from home occasionally. Given both the safety concerns surrounding his conduct and his treatment needs, the Commonwealth recommended he be admitted to Abraxas, which would ensure both his and the community’s safety while he works through this new diagnosis. He has been “wandering the streets aimlessly,” the Commonwealth argued, and Abraxas would provide needed structure, as they are aware of his history, treatments, and behaviors and will match him with the treatments and programs that community sources of assistance cannot provide. N.T. at 19. “We do think a placement at Abraxas within this STP program would be the most appropriate at this time,” the Commonwealth concluded. N.T. at 19:

The Juvenile Court responded to this recommendation by directing the Commonwealth to address the court's concern that B.B. has only now been diagnosed properly, as it asks, "What about the potential that he was misdiagnosed in the beginning?" The Commonwealth responded, "regardless of if he'd been misdiagnosed, the behaviors are still there. The behaviors still need to be addressed. And he still needs help with those behaviors. And Abraxas has the ability . . . to assist him with those behaviors." N.T. at 19

The Juvenile court, however, countered with Dr. Lebdev's testimony in which she opined there could have been more progress within the current arrangement if they had the right diagnoses of autism. N.T. at 19-20. The Juvenile Court assessed B.B.'s behaviors in light of the incomplete understanding of his condition and the lack of a fully accurate diagnoses during his time at home, and it considered whether it would be in best interest to keep B.B. at home while they apply new and appropriate autism therapies. The Commonwealth replies, however, that another two to four weeks are needed before they know the extent of his diagnosis and the treatments recommended, and so it advocates that Abraxas is well-suited to meet B.B.'s current needs, both now and when the additional information is obtained. N.T. at 20.

The juvenile court indicated that it would prefer to talk with Abraxas, as it was not clear whether Abraxas represented the least restrictive alternative. N.T. at 21. Ms. Addie Bertram, Community Relations Manager for the Abraxas Specialized Treatment Program ("STP") was called to the witness stand. She

testified that the STP is for 15-year-old males and comprises three tracks, a sexual offender program, a fire-setter program, and an intensive needs program. N.T. at 24.

After describing different groups who benefit and the therapies that would be offered to them, Ms. Bertram confirmed there is programming tailored to autistic individuals. The treatment plan, she explained, would be to team the autistic child with the "Intermediate Unit 1," which would create a treatment plan that would include both a "one-on-one" master level therapist as well as group programs. N.T. at 26. She explained that the program will accept boys with IQs as low as 65. N.T. at 26.

On cross-examination, Ms. Bertram was asked if B.B. would be on the same unit with juvenile fire-setters and juvenile sex offenders. She answered that he would not be part of the specific groups where they receive their particular services and treatments and would not be sharing a bedroom with them, but she acknowledged that he may have contact with them. N.T. at 27. He would receive his Individualized Educational Plan ("IEP") and undertake a six-month program in the Specialized Treatment Unit. N.T. at 28.

On redirect, Ms. Bertram was asked if a child with autism would receive a different educational program, and she advised that the educational programs are tailored to needs and the children are separated by groups, with the assistance of the Intermediate Unit. N.T. at 28-29. Ms. Bertram also testified that she was present for B.B.'s referral interview, and spoke positively about his participation in the interview, saying he asked appropriate questions

about the program, was interested to hear answers, and he asked about home passes. N.T. at 29.

The juvenile court asked Ms. Bertram to address medication management at Abraxas, and she answered that such management occurs under the guidance of a psychiatrist, who provides psychiatric services to the children. N.T. at 30. The court also asked about health and wellness evaluations, and Ms. Bertram answered that eye, dental, and health exams are given in the first 30 days, and a nurse is employed and on grounds. N.T. at 30.

B.B.'s probation officer Julian Pintola testified that B.B. was scheduled to meet with Adelphoi Village MST¹ on the belief that the arrangement could offer a better service and work more closely with the family, but Pintola observed that the changed circumstances consisting of the escalation of concern with B.B.'s behavior prevented that possibility. N.T., 12/1/25, at 10. While Pintola noted that the Adelphoi Village MST services could not occur during an out-of-home placement, such testimony did not criticize the decision to resort to out-of-home placement, it simply stated the fact that MST services required an in-home status of the juvenile.

¹ We take judicial notice that "MST," which stands for "multisystemic therapy," "is an individualized treatment model in which families set treatment goals and collaborate with practitioners in designing and implementing interventions to meet these goals."

Therefore, a review of the juvenile court's commentary during open court, its written dispositional order, and its Pa.R.A.P. 1925(a) opinion² reveals that it considered the least restrictive placement of B.B. in his home but concluded that his defiant, unpredictable, and troubling behavior over many months of probation, including time wearing an ankle monitor, remained noncompliant and beyond the ability of his mother to manage. Furthermore, as discussed above, the juvenile court gives sufficient reasons for ordering an out-of-home placement, including B.B.'s access to autism resources at Abraxas, such that we find the record, as discussed *supra*, supports such reasons. Therefore, finding no abuse of discretion, we uphold the order at issue.

Order affirmed.

² ***See Interest of S.N.O.***, (non-precedential decision) 356 A.3d 900, fn 6. (Pa. Super. filed February 13, 2026) (observing that sufficiently detailed opinion giving reasons for out-of-home placement may cure a juvenile court's order and disposition in open court that defectively fell short of the Rule 512(d) and its directive that the court shall enter, *inter alia*, its findings and conclusions of law into the record pursuant to Rule 515) (citing ***Interest of N.E.M.***, 311 A.3d 1088, 1101 (Pa. 2024) (Pursuant to Pa.R.A.P. 126(b) (effective May 1, 2019): (1) As used in this rule, "non-precedential decision" refers to an unpublished non-precedential memorandum decision of the Superior Court filed after May 1, 2019 ... [and] (2) non-precedential decisions as defined in (b)(1) may be cited for their persuasive value.)).

Judgment Entered.

Benjamin D. Kohler

Benjamin D. Kohler, Esq.
Prothonotary

DATE: 08/21/2026