

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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 BRYAN P. et al., Persons
Coming Under the Juvenile Court
Law.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN
AND FAMILY SERVICES

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

BEATRIZ C.,

Defendant and Appellant.

B277307

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. DK05104)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los
Angeles County, Teresa Sullivan, Judge. Dismissed.

Suzanne Davidson, under appointment by the Court of
Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

Mary C. Wickham, County Counsel, R. Keith Davis,
Assistant County Counsel and Brian Mahler, Senior Associate
County Counsel for Plaintiff and Respondent

The mother, Beatriz C., has appealed from the dispositional order in a dependency case. The Department of Children and Family Services has moved to dismiss the mother's appeal. We agree the appeal is moot and order dismissal.

The dispositional order directed that the family be subject to six months of informal supervision. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 360, subd. (b); Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.695(a)(2).) The six months of informal supervision have now elapsed and the parties agree no new dependency proceedings have been instituted. Thus, the appeal is moot as there is no effectual relief we can provide to the mother. (*Eye Dog Foundation v. State Board of Guide Dogs for the Blind* (1967) 67 Cal.2d 536, 541; *In re B.L.* (2012) 204 Cal.App.4th 1111, 1117; *In re Melissa R.* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 24, 34; *In re B.D.* (2008) 159 Cal.App.4th 1218, 1240-1241; *In re Karen G.* (2004) 121 Cal.App.4th 1384, 1390; *In re Albert G.* (2003) 113 Cal.App.4th 132, 135; *In re Dani R.* (2001) 89 Cal.App.4th 402, 405-406; *In re Jessica K.* (2000) 79 Cal.App.4th 1313, 1315-1316.)

We reject the mother's arguments that we should decide the appeal on its merits. The mother argues we have the inherent authority to decide a moot case. Among the circumstances where the merits of an otherwise moot appeal may be decided are where there are issues of public importance present or recurring legal questions. None is present here. Further, an appeal may not be moot if the challenged orders

would adversely affect the mother in future dependency proceedings. The mother's arguments that the issues she raises here about the jurisdictional order may have some unspecified future adverse impact in presently un contemplated and unfiled dependency proceedings is speculative.

The appeal is dismissed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL
REPORTS

TURNER, P. J.

We concur:

KRIEGLER, J.

DUNNING, J. *

* Judge of the Orange Superior Court, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.