

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

In re M.B., a Person Coming
Under the Juvenile Court Law.

B284652
(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. DK14631)

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN
AND FAMILY SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

T.B.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Nancy Ramirez, Judge. Affirmed.

Jesse McGowan, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

Mary C. Wickham, County Counsel, R. Keith Davis, Assistant County Counsel, and William D. Thetford, Deputy

County Counsel, Deputy County Counsel, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

* * * * *

Father T.B. challenges a juvenile court's jurisdictional order pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 300. He admits that jurisdiction was appropriate on multiple grounds but argues that there was no evidence his son M.B. was at risk of sexual abuse. We affirm.

BACKGROUND

1. Petition

The Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) filed a petition to adjudicate M.B. a dependent of the juvenile court in December 2015, when M.B. was almost two years old. DCFS alleged that mother and father had a history of engaging in violent altercations in front of M.B. Father threatened mother with a gun. Father physically assaulted father's friend; he physically attacked mother's maternal grandmother and maternal grandmother's companion. Father physically and sexually abused T.C. (a child unrelated to father) by penetrating her vagina with his penis. DCFS alleged that this extensive history of violent conduct placed M.B. at substantial risk of harm—including physical harm and sexual abuse.

2. Father's Criminal Convictions

While the dependency proceedings were pending, father pled no contest to domestic battery involving mother (Pen Code, § 243, subd. (e)(1)). He also pled guilty to multiple counts of human trafficking. (Pen. Code, § 236.1, subd. (c)(2).) Father pled guilty to inflicting corporal injury on a victim. (Pen. Code,

§ 273.5, subd. (a).) Father admitted he suffered a prior strike conviction within the meaning of the “Three Strikes” law. On January 20, 2017, the court sentenced father to serve an 18-year prison sentence. Father also was required to register as a sex offender.

3. DCFS Reports

According to social worker reports, prior to these dependency proceedings, T.C. had been identified as a victim of human trafficking, and father was identified as her pimp. Father may have had a pattern of exploiting young girls to work as prostitutes. DCFS further reported that father was a member of the Crips gang.

When interviewed in December 2015, T.C. confirmed that she generally met with about 10 men a week. T.C. acknowledged that father was her pimp. T.C. indicated that sometimes father brought M.B. to her home. T.C. reported that father had physically assaulted her multiple times. T.C. also observed father assault another woman.

Mother reported that father wanted to renounce his parental rights to M.B. Mother also reported that father used drugs and threatened her with a gun. Mother believed that T.C. was father’s girlfriend. Mother confirmed that father had attacked both her maternal grandmother and maternal grandmother’s companion earlier that year. Law enforcement responded to an incident of domestic violence between mother and father on November 27, 2015; previously, they responded to a domestic violence call between mother and father, and to an incident where father assaulted neighbors.

Father acknowledged that he previously served a prior prison term for committing a terrorist threat in violation of Penal

Code section 422, and that he was on parole at the time of detention. He also had been convicted for theft.

4. Jurisdiction and Dispositional Hearing

Father objected to hearsay statements in the social workers' reports. The parties submitted the matter without testimony. The juvenile court sustained all of the allegations. The court indicated that father was a "very violent person." Father was ordered to complete the following courses: domestic violence, drug and alcohol, and parenting. He also was required to attend individual counseling and was given monitored visits with M.B. M.B. was released to mother's custody and mother was required to attend individual counseling.

DISCUSSION

Father's sole argument on appeal is that the finding that M.B. was at substantial risk of sexual abuse was not supported by substantial evidence. As a general rule, "a single jurisdictional finding supported by substantial evidence is sufficient to support jurisdiction and render moot a challenge to the other findings." (*In re M.W.* (2015) 238 Cal.App.4th 1444, 1452.) Such is the case here. Since "we cannot render any relief to Father that would have a practical, tangible impact on his position in the dependency proceeding" (*In re I.A.* (2011) 201 Cal.App.4th 1484, 1492), we therefore decline to consider father's argument.

The purpose of dependency law is to protect children. (*In re I.A.*, *supra*, 201 Cal.App.4th at p. 1491.) "The court asserts jurisdiction with respect to a child when one of the statutory prerequisites listed in [Welfare and Institutions Code] section 300 has been demonstrated." (*Ibid.*) When a single finding is supported by the evidence the court may decline to consider other jurisdictional findings. (*Id.* at p. 1492.) Moreover, a

“jurisdictional finding involving one parent is ‘ “good against both. More accurately, the minor is a dependent if the actions of either parent bring [the minor] within one of the statutory definitions of a dependent.” ’ ” (*Ibid*; see *In re Briana V.* (2015) 236 Cal.App.4th 297, 308.)

Father makes no challenge to the jurisdictional findings against mother. As noted above, for this reason alone we may decline to consider the remaining jurisdictional findings. (*In re Briana V., supra*, 236 Cal.App.4th at p. 308.) Further, father does not challenge the jurisdictional findings against him except for the finding that M.B. was at risk of sexual abuse. “Under these circumstances, the issues Father’s appeal raises are ‘ “abstract or academic questions of law” ’ [citation], since we cannot render any relief to Father that would have a practical, tangible impact on his position in the dependency proceeding. Even if we found no adequate evidentiary support for the juvenile court’s findings with respect to his conduct, we would not reverse the court’s jurisdictional and dispositional orders nor vacate the court’s assertion of personal jurisdiction over his parental rights.” (*In re I.A., supra*, 201 Cal.App.4th at p. 1492; see *In re Alexis E.* (2009) 171 Cal.App.4th 438, 451 [“When a dependency petition alleges multiple grounds for its assertion that a minor comes within the dependency court’s jurisdiction, a reviewing court can affirm the juvenile court’s finding of jurisdiction over the minor if any one of the statutory bases for jurisdiction that are enumerated in the petition is supported by substantial evidence.”].)

Although father argues that the finding M.B. was at risk of sexual abuse could have other consequences for him, he has not identified any practical consequence outside the dependency proceedings. He states that it could affect future family law

proceedings, but he provides no support for this assertion. Additionally, father's argument ignores his current lengthy incarceration period, which effectively prevents him from maintaining a custodial relationship with M.B.

Finally, father ignores the critical fact that he was required to register as a sex offender. "When a parent is required to register as a sex offender, this constitutes prima facie evidence that the subject minor is at substantial risk of abuse or neglect. (§ 355.1, subd. (d)(4).) Thus, father is already living with a presumption that his children are subject to dependency jurisdiction." (*In re Briana V.*, *supra*, 236 Cal.App.4th at p. 310.) "Nothing we do in this appeal will make him a nonoffending parent." (*Ibid.*)

DISPOSITION

The jurisdictional and dispositional orders are affirmed.

ROGAN, J.*

WE CONCUR:

BIGELOW, P. J.

GRIMES, J.

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