

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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 SIX

In re E.T., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

2d Juv. No. B241534
(Super. Ct. No. J-1395354)
(Santa Barbara County)

CHILD PROTECTIVE SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ADRIANA T.,

Defendant and Appellant.

Adriana T. appeals from the order entered May 10 2012, terminating her parental rights to her biological daughter, E. T., pursuant to Welfare & Institutions Code section 366.26. We appointed counsel to represent her on appeal.

On July 11, 2012, counsel filed a brief in which no arguable issues were raised. On July 12, 2012, we notified appellant that she had 30 days within which to submit any contentions that she wished us to consider, and that the appeal would be dismissed in the absence of any arguable issues. (*In re Phoenix H.* (2009) 47 Cal.4th 835, 844-846; *In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952, 994.)

Appellant responded with three letters describing her love for her biological child and her struggle with mental health and substance abuse issues. We do not doubt appellant's sincerity, but her love for her child and her desire to remain clean and sober are not sufficient reasons to reverse the juvenile court's order. (See, e.g., *In re Beatrice M.* (1994) 29 Cal.App.4th 1411, 1419-1420; *In re Bailey J.* (2010) 189 Cal.App.4th 1308, 1316; *In re Levi U.* (2000) 78 Cal.App.4th 191, 200.) At the section 366.26 hearing, the evidence showed that appellant was participating in a substance abuse program but had not yet addressed her mental health issues. Our review of the record discloses that the juvenile court's findings of fact are supported by substantial evidence and that it properly exercised its discretion in terminating appellant's parental rights and selecting adoption as the permanent plan for the child. (*In re Bailey J.*, *supra*, 189 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1316-1317.)

The judgment (section 366.26 order terminating parental rights) is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

YEGAN, J.

We concur:

GILBERT, P.J.

PERREN, J.

Arthur A. Garcia, Judge
Superior Court County of Santa Barbara

Frank H. Free , under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for
Appellant.

Sarah McElhenney, Deputy County Counsel, for Respondent.