

ROYAL COURT
(Samedi Division)

123.

20th June, 1994

Before: The Bailiff, and
Jurats Orchard and Vibert

Representation of

E

Curator of

F

The Attorney General

First Party Convened

**The Education Committee of
the States of Jersey**

Second Party Convened

Application by the Representor for a revocation of a Care Order
made pursuant to Article 29(1)(b) of the Children (Jersey) Law, 1968.

Advocate P.C. Harris for the Representor.
The Solicitor General.

JUDGMENT

THE BAILIFF: It is quite clear to the Court that **F** is very
fond and indeed loves her child and wants that child to return to
her home on a permanent basis and there is no evidence to suggest
that he, in turn, does not love her. But the matter cannot stop
5 there. Obviously one does not wish to deprive a parent of the joy
of bringing up a son or daughter, but unfortunately when that
parent has certain difficulties which I need not recite here -

they are referred to in the Children's Officer's report - and the child himself has undergone problems, and they are referred to in Mr. Biddle's report of 1991, it is quite apparent that the interests of the child are paramount. Applying that principle, 5 which is really the main one we have to consider, I repeat we do not in any way doubt F's sincerity, her genuine wish, or indeed her genuine affection and love for that child but we cannot find it proved - and it is on the balance of probabilities, of course, in an application of this sort - that she would be able 10 to cope so that the child would not suffer.

Accordingly we find ourselves unable to grant the application.

No authorities.

12/11/91