

**IN THE COURT OF APPEALS  
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT OF OHIO  
HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO**

IN RE: JORDAN CELAK	:	APPEAL NO. C-110174
DEBBIE ESTEP	:	TRIAL NO. F05-1996x
and	:	<i>JUDGMENT ENTRY.</i>
STEVEN BLAIR,		
Petitioners-Appellants,		
v.		
STEPHANIE CELEK		
Respondent-Appellee.		

We consider this appeal on the accelerated calendar, and this judgment entry is not an opinion of the court. *See* S.Ct.R.Rep.Op. 3(A); App.R. 11.1(E); Loc.R. 11.1.1.

Petitioners-appellants Debbie Estep and Steven Blair (“the paternal grandparents”) appeal the trial court’s judgment denying their request for visitation with their granddaughter Jordan Celek. For the following reasons, we affirm.

In their appeal, the paternal grandparents argue that the trial court abused its discretion by denying their petition for visitation with their granddaughter. We are unpersuaded.

In deciding whether to grant grandparent-visitation, a trial court must determine whether visitation is in the child’s best interest, and in doing so, it must consider the factors set forth in R.C. 3109.051(D). *Bratz v. Bratz*, 85 Ohio St.3d 40, 44-

**OHIO FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS**

---

45, 1999-Ohio-203, 706 N.E.2d 1218. A trial court has broad discretion in determining visitation rights. A reviewing court will not reverse its decision on that issue absent an abuse of discretion. *Appleby v. Appleby*, 24 Ohio St.3d 39, 40-41, 492 N.E.2d 83 (1986). An abuse of discretion implies that the court's attitude is unreasonable, arbitrary or unconscionable. *Blakemore v. Blakemore*, 5 Ohio St.3d 217, 219, 450 N.E.2d 1140 (1983).

In grandparent-visitation cases, this court has held that a parent's wishes regarding visitation must be given special weight, but that the parent's wishes must also be balanced with the other factors set forth in R.C. 3109.051(D). *Estep v. Celek*, 1st Dist. No. C-081117, 2009-Ohio-4990, ¶ 10.

Here, the paternal grandparents argue that the trial court only considered the wishes of Jordan's mother, respondent-appellee Stephanie Celek, and did not balance those wishes with the remaining R.C. 3109.051(D) factors. But our review of the record belies that assertion. Here, the trial court considered all of the R.C. 3109.051(D) factors and determined that there was no sufficient reason to overcome the mother's wishes that the paternal grandparents not have visitation with Jordan because of the mother's valid fear that the paternal grandparents would allow Jordan to have contact with her father. And while there was some indication in the record that Jordan was currently being reconciled with her father under court supervision, this did not alleviate the concern that Jordan could possibly be exposed to her father through visitation with the paternal grandparents.

Accordingly, we affirm the trial court's judgment.

Further, a certified copy of this judgment entry shall be sent to the trial court under App.R. 27. Costs shall be taxed under App.R. 24.

**OHIO FIRST DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS**

---

**DINKELACKER, P.J., HILDEBRANDT and HENDON, JJ.**

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court on February 10, 2012

per order of the court \_\_\_\_\_.  
Presiding Judge