

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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 R.M., A Minor Coming  
Under the Juvenile Court Law.

---

LOS ANGELES COUNTY  
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN  
AND FAMILY SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

T.M.,

---

Defendant and Appellant.

B294656

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. CK92923)

APPEAL from orders of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Anthony Trendacosta, Judge. Dismissed.

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

Mary C. Wickham, County Counsel, Kristine P. Miles, Assistant County Counsel, and Kim Nemoy, Principal Deputy County Counsel, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

In September 2017, R.M. was declared a dependent of the court. The court denied reunification services to both parents under section 361.5, subdivisions (b)(10) through (b)(13). The court ordered monitored visitation for the parents. In 2018, Mother filed a petition under Welfare and Institutions Code section 388 requesting that the court order reunification services. The trial court denied Mother's petition and Mother appealed.

On our motion, we take judicial notice of the minute order dated October 1, 2019. (See Evid. Code, § 452, subd. (d).) Additionally, the Department requests judicial notice of post-judgment evidence, namely three minute orders from June 2019. Mother did not oppose the request. We grant the request and take judicial notice of the minute orders. (See Evid. Code, § 452, subd. (d).)

Since appealing, Mother filed another section 388 petition on May 21, 2019 also seeking family reunification services. On October 1, 2019, the trial court granted Mother's petition and ordered family reunification services. In light of this recent order, Mother's appeal challenging the denial of her section 388 petition seeking reunification services is moot. Both parties agree. The case is dismissed. (*In re Dani R.* (2001) 89 Cal.App.4th 402, 404–405.)

#### **DISPOSITION**

We dismiss the appeal as moot.

WILEY, J.

WE CONCUR:

BIGELOW, P. J.

STRATTON, J.