

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

LOS ANGELES COUNTY  
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN  
AND FAMILY SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

MICHELE D.,

Defendant and Appellant.

B269353

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. DK11874)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Emma Castro, Referee. Dismissed.

Michele D., in pro. Per., for Defendant and Appellant.

Mary C. Wickham, County Counsel, R. Keith Davis,  
Assistant County Counsel and David Michael Miller, Deputy  
County Counsel for Plaintiff and Respondent

The mother, Michele D., appeals from a dispositional order. The child, M.W., was removed from the mother's custody at the November 9, 2015 dispositional hearing. Later, on July 8, 2016, the juvenile court terminated jurisdiction over M.W.

The Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services has moved to dismiss the appeal because it is moot in light of the July 8, 2016 termination order. We agree the appeal is moot because 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.) There is no merit to the mother's opposition to the dismissal motion. The mother merely reiterates the claims of error presented in her opening brief and has failed to demonstrate: what effectual relief we can provide her; how there are any detrimental collateral effects of the now terminated jurisdictional and dispositional orders; or the presence of an issue of broad public interest raised by this appeal.

The appeal is dismissed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE  
OFFICIAL REPORTS

TURNER, P. J.

We concur:

KRIEGLER, J.

KIN, J.\*

---

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