

Filed 12/22/16 In re D.R. CA2/5

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FIVE

In re D.R., a Person Coming Under
the Juvenile Court Law.

B270912
(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. DK10962)

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN
AND FAMILY SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

B.R.,

Defendant and Appellant.

Appeal from orders of the Superior Court of the County of
Los Angeles, Natalie Stone, Judge. Affirmed.

Law Office of Linda Puertas, Linda B. Puertas, under
appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant.

Office of the County Counsel, Mary C. Wickham, County Counsel, R. Keith Davis, Assistant County Counsel, and Aileen Wong, Deputy County Counsel for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Defendant and appellant B.R. (mother), the mother of minor D.R., appeals from the juvenile court's jurisdictional findings and dispositional order removing custody of D.R. from her. According to mother, there was insufficient evidence to support the juvenile court's: (i) findings that her conduct in allowing a known sexual predator access to her home and in leaving D.R. at home unsupervised created a risk to his physical and emotional well-being; and (ii) order removing custody of D.R. from her.

We hold substantial evidence supported the challenged findings and removal order. We therefore affirm the judgment.

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

A. Detention Report

On February 23, 2015, D.R. and his family came to the attention of the Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) due to a call to the child abuse hotline. The caller reported that mother generally neglected her children, D.R. and 18-year-old K.R., who was autistic and had Aspergers. According to the caller, when K.R. was 12 years old, she was raped by a neighbor named "Bob." And, Bob continued to be around the children "until a month or two ago." The caller explained that K.R. "adored[d] Bob as he [was] the only friend [K.R.] had due to her Aspergers."

The caller also reported that mother did not buy food for the children and rarely cooked for them. Instead, the owner of the home in which mother and the children lived made sure the children ate. Without the owner's help, the children would go without eating.

The caller also advised that mother was being evicted from the home, causing the caller to be concerned that mother might turn to Bob for financial help. Mother never seemed to have any money, even though she was receiving K.R.'s survivor benefits.

The caller believed mother was "really hard on [D.R.]." She yelled at him and gave "him the impression that he [was] never going to make it." She blamed "D.R. for everything." The caller cautioned that the "children will say what their mother wants them to say and will cover up for her. Mother [was] very manipulative to the others."

On February 27, 2015, a children's social worker (CSW) attempted to visit mother's home, but no one answered the door. That same day, DCFS received another hotline call about the family. The caller reported D.R. arrived at school that morning feeling "light headed" and complaining that he did not feel well. D.R. told the caller that there was no food in the house and he (D.R.) did not have dinner the night before. The caller fed D.R. and told him to visit the school nurse, but he said he would rather go to class because he was behind. The caller described D.R. as "tiny" and expressed concern for his well-being. The caller said D.R. had missed "a lot of school."

According to the caller, mother's landlord, Janice, called D.R.'s school and reported that mother did not feed the children and did not buy them food. Janice tried to feed the children when she could. But Janice was in her 80's and lived on a fixed income.

Janice expressed her belief that mother was unstable and seemed unable to obtain consistent employment. She said mother would keep D.R. home from school on the pretext that mother was not feeling well.

When a CSW made an unannounced visit to mother's home, mother welcomed the CSW into the home, which appeared clean, but smelled of cat urine. The kitchen was clean and the refrigerator and pantry were well stocked with food. The bathroom and children's bedrooms were clean and "appropriate."

The CSW spoke with D.R. alone in the living room. He was tall and thin, but had no observable signs of physical abuse. D.R. said he was doing well and talked about school. When the CSW asked D.R. about the referral allegations, he said mother bought groceries a few days ago, and before that there was food in the house, but nothing that he wanted to eat. D.R. explained he ate "all the time. Like every three hours. [He had] to eat a lot. [He was] like a truck. [He] constantly need[ed] junk food, snacks not real food and [the family] didn't have any more snacks." When asked if he had eaten that day, D.R. said he skipped breakfast and lunch at school because he was busy, but ate dinner at Taco Bell. D.R. admitted he was under stress because he was a drum major at school and had "a lot of class work to keep up with." He claimed to be comfortable at home and denied any physical abuse or mental health needs.

The CSW spoke to K.R. who brought mother into the room. When the CSW asked mother about the referral allegations, mother "appeared as if she [had] heard these allegations before." Mother stated, "I don't know who keeps calling you guys and I'm sorry you have to waste your time on this. My kids are okay." Mother claimed the family always had food in the home, but

complained that the children “just like[d] snacks like chips and cookies.” Mother advised the CSW that she “was not on food stamps, but was applying for them.” She was also trying to obtain survivor benefits for D.R. and K.R., as their father was deceased. Mother was not working, but was looking for work. Other than K.R.’s autism, mother denied she or the children had any mental health issues.

On March 5, 2015, a CSW spoke to a reporting party who stated D.R. had not been in school all week and mother had not attempted to call the school to explain his absences. The party said D.R. was protective of mother and would lie to protect her.

That same day, the CSW arranged to meet with mother and the children the next day. When the CSW met with mother as scheduled, mother explained she had three roommates, and one of their friends threatened to “call DCFS on [her]” because he was mad at her. Mother told the CSW that she and her children rented three rooms from Janice, who also lived in the house along with a couple who rented a room in the back of the house.

The CSW met with D.R. who told her he was 14 years old and in ninth grade at San Dimas High School. D.R. denied there was no food in the house and claimed mother either cooked or bought food. When asked about Bob, D.R. denied knowing anyone by that name and said there had been no sexual abuse in the home.

The CSW spoke to K.R. who claimed that there was “plenty of food” and that mother cooked “all the time.” When asked whether she had been sexually abused, K.R. said, “I don’t know.” K.R. also denied knowing anyone named Bob.

When the CSW informed mother of the additional referral allegations, mother volunteered that she had reported the sexual

abuse of K.R. by Bob, but neither DCFS nor the police did anything about it. Mother denied allowing Bob access to her children after she reported his abuse of K.R. Mother informed the CSW that she would be moving out of the house at the end of March.

On March 17, 2015, the CSW spoke to K.R.'s classroom teacher at San Dimas High School. K.R. had complained to the teacher that there was "no food or money and that [mother] was not always home." An instructional aide heard K.R. complain that "there [was] no food[,] and [the aide] dropped off food at [K.R.'s] house anonymously." K.R.'s teacher believed mother did not come home until 3:00 a.m. and that K.R. was not supervised during the day.

On March 27, 2015, a different CSW made a follow-up visit to mother's home. D.R. told the CSW that mother was not home and would not return for three hours. D.R. and K.R. claimed "all was well" and they had nothing new to report. The CSW observed the refrigerator and pantry were stocked with food.

The CSW spoke with Janice alone. Janice told the CSW that she had given mother an eviction notice, but mother responded by stating she would be "fighting it." Janice had recently "returned home from a hospital stay and noticed two checks missing." She suspected mother had taken them. Mother and the children had lived with Janice for 15 years. Janice helped mother for the sake of the children, but now that they were older, Janice believed the children could take care of themselves.

On April 3, 2015, DCFS received another hotline call about the family. The caller and D.R.'s therapist visited the family's home for a scheduled appointment with D.R. and mother. D.R.

told the caller that his mother was not home and might not return until 3:00 a.m. When the caller telephoned mother, she did not answer. Janice told the caller that there was a lack of supervision of the children in the home. According to Janice, mother went to the casino often and left D.R. home alone overnight. Janice also confirmed that she was not responsible for supervising D.R. D.R.'s therapist spoke to the CSW by telephone and was concerned because mother had a pattern of leaving D.R. home alone unsupervised.

Upon receipt of the referral, a CSW went to the home and spoke to Janice and D.R. D.R. did not want to speak with the CSW until mother came home. Janice told the CSW that mother would leave for "days at a time," come home in the middle of the night, and sleep until the afternoon.

On April 6, 2015, the CSW again visited the home and informed mother of the new allegations. Mother was upset and claimed that she had been out late cleaning offices. Mother explained that the children ate at school and she would either make them dinner or buy them something to eat. Mother said there were always adults in the home when she was away.

On April 6, 2015, a CSW received a call from a man named "Terry" who rented the back room of D.R.'s house and shared it with his girlfriend "Anita." He was concerned about D.R. and K.R. According to Terry, when K.R. was younger, she had been raped by a man named Bob, and Bob was now associating with the family again. Terry reported that "[s]omeone saw [Bob] with [K.R.] in Wal-Mart." Terry and his friends believed "Bob was paying mother to have sex with [K.R.]" Mother had told Anita about Bob, and Anita heard K.R. admit that she needed a new boyfriend because all Bob wanted to do was have sex. A friend of

Anita's confronted mother about "pimping out" K.R.; and the friend also confronted Bob. According to Terry, "[t]hat was when Bob stopped coming around because [mother] knew people knew what [mother] was doing."

Terry told the CSW that D.R. knew "everything. [The children were] trained not to talk to authorities. [Mother] had a real bad side, she's vicious, she's devious." Terry said he and others in the home fed D.R. and K.R. because mother would leave them alone without food or money. Terry encouraged D.R. to tell the truth about K.R. and about mother leaving the children alone without food. But D.R. refused because mother "had [the children] coached really well, she [told] them what to say to [the CSWs]."

The next day, mother called the CSW and cancelled the child and family team meeting scheduled for that evening. Mother claimed she had an opportunity to make money and would not be able to meet. When the CSW advised mother it was her responsibility to properly supervise her children, mother told the CSW that K.R. was 18 years old. The CSW reminded mother K.R. was autistic and had the maturity level of a 13-year old. Mother then asked, "What is the legal age to leave kids alone because [D.R. was] 14?" The CSW responded that leaving a 14-year old alone at home with no adult supervision for days was considered child abuse.

On April 21, 2015, the CSW received a call from a dean at San Dimas High School. D.R. and Janice were in the dean's office to report an incident between D.R. and Terry that had occurred that morning. The dean told the CSW that police officers were at the school interviewing D.R. When the CSW asked the dean if there were any other issues, the dean

responded, “The same thing [the school] keep[s] reporting. [D.R. was] hungry and mother [was] not home.” D.R. told the dean that mother left home at 8:00 p.m. the night before and still was not home or answering her telephone. The dean advised that “this [was an] on-going problem with mother.” The dean saw D.R. at school every morning, and every morning D.R. “complain[ed] of being hungry and that he [had not] seen his mom.” Janice told the dean she fed D.R. and K.R. because she “felt bad for them,” but that she could no longer afford to do so.

Following the dean’s telephone call, the CSW went to D.R.’s school where she was told by the investigating police officer that he was not going to file a report because D.R. denied abuse. The CSW then met with D.R. and Janice in an office. D.R. told the CSW he did not wake up in time for school. When Terry poured water on D.R. to wake him, he yelled at Terry. D.R. then pushed Terry, and Terry grabbed him by the arm “to take him out of the room to go to school.” According to D.R., “It wasn’t hard[;] it was just to take [D.R.] out of [his] room.”

Janice informed the CSW that mother left home around 10:00 p.m. the night before and had not returned. And she advised that mother had not been home during the prior weekend.

The CSW informed D.R. of DCFS’s decision to remove him from mother’s home. D.R. stated that “he didn’t understand why [he was being removed from mother] if he was fine.” D.R. claimed there was food at home and that mother did come home.

Janice told the CSW that Bob had been at the house the prior Saturday, but she was not sure why he was there. The CSW asked Janice to pack D.R.’s belongings, and she agreed to do so.

D.R. expressed concern for K.R., telling the CSW that he usually made dinner for her after she came home from school. D.R. was worried no one would be home to feed K.R.

That same day, mother called the CSW and wanted to know D.R.'s whereabouts. When the CSW explained the reasons for D.R.'s removal from the home, mother claimed there were adults in the home and asked, "What is the law that says I cannot leave my child alone." The CSW told mother that school officials and the police had been trying unsuccessfully to contact mother all day because she had left D.R. alone without food.

On April 22, 2015, the CSW spoke with D.R.'s therapist who believed that there was "a pattern for mother to not be home." The therapist had observed D.R. cry because there was no food in the home. She was concerned that mother did not understand the adverse consequences of leaving D.R. and K.R. alone. According to the therapist, "mother [was] constantly gone [but came] home when she [could]."

B. Detention Hearing

At the April 24, 2015, detention hearing, the juvenile court made the following findings: (1) a prima facie case had been made for detaining D.R. and D.R. was a person described in Welfare and Institutions Code section 300, subdivisions (b), (d), and (j);¹ (2) a substantial danger existed to the physical and emotional health of D.R. and there were no reasonable means to protect him without removal; and (3) DCFS had made reasonable efforts to prevent or eliminate the need for removal and that it

¹ All further statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code.

would be contrary to D.R.'s welfare if he continued to live in the home. The juvenile court vested DCFS with temporary placement and custody of D.R. and gave it discretion to place D.R. with any appropriate relative.

C. Jurisdiction/Disposition Hearing

At the December 9, 2015,² jurisdiction hearing, the juvenile court admitted the exhibits offered by DCFS. The juvenile court then heard testimony from mother and D.R.

1. Mother's Testimony

Mother claimed she worked for a vehicle recovery company from 9:00 p.m. or 10:00 p.m. until morning, three days a week. According to mother, Anita agreed to supervise D.R. while she worked. Mother denied leaving the children alone unsupervised for more than 24 hours.

Mother bought food every day or two. There was enough food for D.R. and he knew how to prepare food for himself. She believed D.R.'s statements about always being hungry had been misinterpreted.

Mother met Bob in 2002; he lived in the same neighborhood. In 2009, she made a referral to DCFS about Bob because he had sexually abused K.R. After the referral, she kept Bob from entering the home to have contact with the children, but sometimes he was there to visit Terry and Anita. Mother denied K.R. had any contact with Bob after the 2009 referral. She also denied receiving any gifts or favors from Bob.

² The hearing spanned three days, from December 9 through 11, 2015.

At the time of the hearing, mother and K.R. had moved and were living with a man named “Christian,” but a representative of DCFS told mother that Christian had “an open case” with DCFS involving his daughter. According to mother, Christian was in the process of evicting her.

2. D.R.’s Testimony

D.R. knew Bob, and mother told D.R. that Bob had sexually abused K.R. He did not recall seeing Bob in his house after mother told him of Bob’s abusive conduct. D.R. told a CSW that he knew to watch out for his sister when Bob was around because Bob “was kinda acting strange” and “a little aloof.” After the abuse of his sister, D.R. “knew to . . . watch out . . . even more.”

D.R. ate breakfast and lunch at school; the only meal he ate at home was dinner. Mother occasionally left D.R. home alone for a few hours. He did not recall having trouble contacting mother if the need arose. D.R. denied mother was ever absent from the home for days at a time and claimed she had never been absent for more than 24 hours.

3. Jurisdictional Findings

At the end of closing arguments, the juvenile court sustained the allegations of two paragraphs in the petition, paragraphs b-1 and b-2. Paragraph b-1 provided: “On numerous prior occasions for the past six years, the child, [D.]R[.]’s developmentally delayed sibling, [K.]R[.], was sexually abused by an unrelated male, . . . aka Bob Q[.] The child’s mother knew of the unrelated male’s . . . sexual abuse of the sibling and failed to protect the sibling in that the mother allowed the unrelated male . . . access to the sibling [*or was not present to protect her*]. Such

sexual abuse of the sibling by the unrelated male and the mother's failure to protect the sibling endangers the child's physical health, safety and well-being and places the child at risk of serious physical harm, damage, danger, sexual abuse and failure to protect."³

Paragraph b-2 provided: "The child, [D.]R[.]'s mother, [B.]R[.], established a detrimental and endangering situation for the child in that on 04/21/2015, and on prior occasions, the mother left the child home alone without adult supervision. Such a detrimental and endangering situation established for the child by the mother and the mother's failure to provide adult supervision for the child endangers the child's physical health and safety and places the child at risk of serious physical harm, damage and danger."

In support of its findings on paragraph b-1, the juvenile court found that there was ample evidence "that [Bob] was around the property; that it was on more than one occasion." The juvenile court further found that despite mother's knowledge that Bob was coming "around" the property, the record clearly showed that she "was not there a lot of the time" to protect her children from the risk of harm posed by Bob's presence. According to the juvenile court, mother's absence during Bob's visits to the home caused D.R. to feel that he was "supposed to be the protector" which created a risk of physical or psychological harm to D.R.

In support of its findings on paragraph b-2, the juvenile court found that there was "evidence that mother would be gone longer than a few hours. The social worker address[ed the issue of authorities] trying to get in touch with mother and not being

³ The juvenile court added the italicized language by a handwritten interlineation.

able to get in touch for very long periods of time, mother being gone all night.” The juvenile court further found that there was “sufficient evidence . . . from statements by the children and by others [to show that] there were numerous occasions when mother [left] the children home for extended periods of time without adult supervision and . . . sometimes without adequate food.”

As to its findings on both paragraphs, the juvenile court added that mother’s act of moving K.R. in with Christian, knowing he had an open case with DCFS concerning his own daughter, demonstrated that mother had an inability to appreciate the risk to her children generally posed by her conduct. The juvenile court also expressly concluded that mother was not a credible witness, finding that “[t]here were many inconsistencies in her testimony as well as comparing her testimony to prior statements.”

4. Dispositional Orders

The juvenile court removed custody of D.R. from mother and placed the “care, custody, control and conduct of the child . . . under the supervision of [DCFS] for suitable placement.” The juvenile court ordered family reunification services for mother and approved a case plan that included random drug testing for mother, a parenting course, and individual counseling for mother and D.R. The order granting mother unmonitored visitation was not changed.

DISCUSSION

A. Standard of Review

“The burden of proof at the jurisdiction phase in the juvenile court is preponderance of the evidence; the burden of proof at disposition is clear and convincing evidence. (§ 355, subd. (a) [jurisdiction findings by preponderance of evidence]; § 361, subd. (c) [disposition findings by clear and convincing evidence].) Nonetheless, we review both jurisdiction findings and the disposition order for substantial evidence. (See *Sheila S. v. Superior Court* (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 872, 880-881 [101 Cal.Rptr.2d 187] [“The “clear and convincing” standard . . . is for the edification and guidance of the trial court and not a standard for appellant review. [Citations.] “The sufficiency of evidence to establish a given fact, where the law requires proof of the fact to be clear and convincing, is primarily a question for the trial court to determine, and if there is substantial evidence to support its conclusion, the determination is not open to review on appeal”]; see also *Crail v. Blakely* (1973) 8 Cal.3d 744, 750 [106 Cal.Rptr. 187, 505 P.2d 1027]; *In re I. W.* (2009) 180 Cal.App.4th 1517, 1525-1526 [103 Cal.Rptr.3d 538].)” (*In re Christopher R.* (2014) 225 Cal.App.4th 1210, 1216, fn. 4.) “Under this test, we resolve all conflicts in the evidence, and indulge all reasonable inferences that may be derived from the evidence, in favor of the court’s findings. (*In re Savannah M.* (2005) 131 Cal.App.4th 1387, 1393 [32 Cal.Rptr.3d 526].)” (*In re Mia Z.* (2016) 246 Cal.App.4th 883, 891.)

B. Analysis

1. Jurisdictional Findings

a. Risk of Harm to D.R. from Mother's Failure to Protect K.R. from Sexual Abuse

Mother contends there was insufficient evidence to support the juvenile court's finding that D.R. was at risk of harm from mother's failure to protect K.R. from sexual abuse. According to mother, there was no evidence that D.R. had experienced serious physical harm or illness from Bob's visits to the home.

The juvenile court found true the allegations in paragraph b-1 of the petition that mother's failure to protect K.R. from the risk of sexual abuse posed by Bob created a risk of harm to D.R. Substantial evidence supported that finding.

Mother does not dispute that K.R. was sexually abused by Bob in 2009 when she was 13 years old. Even though K.R. was 18 years old at the time the petition was filed, she remained vulnerable and in need of adult supervision because she had the maturity of a 13-year-old minor. And, although mother denied she gave Bob access to K.R. after the 2009 incident of sexual abuse, there was evidence from which the juvenile court could have reasonably concluded that Bob had continued access to K.R. Janice, Terry, and Anita all believed Bob continued to have unsupervised access to K.R. Terry reported someone presumably familiar with the situation had seen Bob and K.R. together at Wal-Mart. Anita heard K.R. state that K.R. needed a new boyfriend because all Bob wanted to do was have sex with her. And, there was evidence that mother left K.R. and D.R. alone unsupervised for long periods of time, notwithstanding her

testimony to the contrary. That evidence, together with the juvenile court's finding that mother was not credible, supported the court's conclusion that Bob continued to have unsupervised access to K.R.

Moreover, there was evidence from which the juvenile court could have reasonably concluded mother's failure to protect K.R. posed a risk of serious harm to D.R. He told a CSW that he felt responsible for K.R.'s welfare when mother was not around, and he testified that he needed to "watch out" for K.R.'s well-being when Bob was around. Vesting a 14-year-old teenager with a sense of responsibility for his autistic sister, including the responsibility to protect her from the known risk posed by Bob's continued presence in the home, created an inherent and serious risk of harm to D.R.'s physical and emotional well-being. Among other things, it exposed D.R. to the risk of a physical confrontation with Bob in the event D.R. witnessed Bob sexually abusing K.R. and attempted to protect her by intervening.

The juvenile court's findings in support of the allegations in paragraph b-1 were reasonable and amply supported by the evidence.

b. Risk of Harm to D.R. from Being Left
Alone Unsupervised and Without Food

Mother argues there was insufficient evidence to support the juvenile court's finding that there existed a risk of harm to D.R. by leaving him home alone and unsupervised by an adult. According to mother, there was no evidence her periodic absences from the home created any danger of serious physical harm to D.R.

The juvenile court found true the allegations in paragraph b-2 that mother was frequently absent from the home for long periods of time, conduct which endangered the physical well-being of D.R. We conclude that there was substantial evidence in the record to support the juvenile court's finding that mother's conduct posed a risk of harm to D.R.

Although mother and D.R. denied that she was ever absent from the home for extended periods of time and claimed that there was adequate food in the home, there was ample evidence from multiple credible sources that mother had a pattern of leaving D.R. alone unsupervised without adequate food or money to buy food. Janice, Terry, and Anita, each of whom lived in the home with D.R., reported that mother would absent herself from the home for long periods of time without providing adequate food for her children. School authorities reported that D.R. and K.R. complained about mother's frequent extended absences and a lack of food. On at least one occasion, D.R. complained to school officials that he was feeling "light headed" and that he did not have dinner the night before. And, D.R.'s therapist corroborated that evidence, including that she had seen D.R. cry because he did not have enough food. Indeed, when D.R. was involved in the physical altercation with Terry in the home, mother was not present as she had reportedly left the home somewhere between 8:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. the previous evening and had not returned. The police and school authorities could not contact mother throughout the day of that incident because she did not return phone calls or messages.

The evidence supported a reasonable inference that mother's repeated and extended absences from the home exposed D.R. to the risk of physical harm from physical altercations with

adult males in the home and a lack of proper nutrition. Therefore, the juvenile court's true finding on paragraph b-2 was amply supported by credible evidence

2. Dispositional Removal Order

Mother contends there was insufficient evidence in support of the juvenile court's order removing custody of D.R. from her. According to mother, there was no evidence that D.R. was in danger while living in mother's home. In addition, mother argues the removal order should be reversed because the trial court failed to address whether there were other reasonable means, short of removal, to protect D.R.

The trial court is permitted to remove a child from the custody of a parent when there exists "a substantial danger to the physical health, safety, protection, or physical or emotional well-being of the minor if the minor were returned home, and there are no reasonable means by which the minor's physical health can be protected without removing the minor from the minor's parent's or guardian's physical custody." (§ 361, subd. (c)(1).)

As discussed above, there was ample evidence of a risk of danger to D.R. posed by mother's conduct while he was living in her home. Despite Bob's known sexual abuse of K.R., mother allowed Bob access to her home while she was away on her extended absences from the home. During those absences, D.R. felt it was his responsibility to protect K.R. when Bob was around. D.R. was therefore unnecessarily exposed to the danger of a physical altercation with Bob. Similarly, mother's extended absences, during which she could not be contacted for emergencies, exposed D.R. to the danger of malnutrition and of physical altercations in the home, as evidenced by D.R.'s morning

report to school officials that he: was “light headed” and feeling ill because he had not eaten dinner the night before; and had been involved in a physical altercation with Terry. In light of the evidence that supported the jurisdictional findings, the removal order was reasonable and had adequate factual support.

Although mother contends that the juvenile court failed to consider reasonable alternatives to removal, the record of the disposition hearing demonstrates that the court considered such alternatives and expressly found that “there [were] no reasonable means by which [D.R.’s] physical health [could] be protected without removing him from mother’s physical custody.” The juvenile court further found that DCFS had “made reasonable efforts to prevent or eliminate the need for removal” And, there was sufficient evidence to support those findings. At the disposition hearing, the juvenile court expressed its concern about mother’s continued inability to appreciate the serious risk of harm to D.R. posed by her neglectful conduct. The juvenile court also expressed deep concern over mother’s current inappropriate housing situation, stating, “I’m not at all convinced that mother is on the verge of securing secure housing.” Moreover, the juvenile court expressly found that mother was not credible, meaning that the court rejected any alternatives to removal proposed by mother because they were not trustworthy, stating, “So those credibility findings inform[ed] my findings on jurisdiction as well as disposition.” Given the juvenile court’s express findings on the issue of alternatives to removal and the ample evidence in support of those findings, we find no merit to mother’s contention that the court failed to consider reasonable alternatives to removal.

DISPOSITION

The jurisdictional findings and the dispositional removal order are affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

KUMAR, J.*

We concur:

KRIEGLER, Acting P. J.

BAKER, J.

* Judge of the Superior Court of the County of Los Angeles, appointed by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.