

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

B299826

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN
AND FAMILY SERVICES,

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No.
17CCJP00795)

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

J.L.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Annabelle G. Cortez, Judge. Conditionally reversed and remanded with directions.

Judy Weissberg-Ortiz, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

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

Nancy Sarinana for the Minor.

J.L. (Father) appeals from a juvenile court order terminating his parental rights over W.L. (Minor) pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 366.26. Father contends the juvenile court erred when it determined the Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services (DCFS) satisfied its inquiry and notice obligations under the Indian Child Welfare Act (ICWA) and related California law in connection with Father and mother D.H.'s (Mother's) claims of possible Indian heritage. Father, DCFS, and Minor have stipulated to a limited reversal and a remand to the juvenile court to permit proper compliance with ICWA and related California law. We accept the parties' stipulation.

Our ability to accept a stipulated reversal and remand in the dependency context is discussed in *In re Rashad H.* (2000) 78 Cal.App.4th 376, 379-382. The present case involves reversible error because the parties agree, and we concur, there was noncompliance with ICWA and related California provisions. (*In re K.R.* (2018) 20 Cal.App.5th 701, 706-709; *In re Michael V.* (2016) 3 Cal.App.5th 225, 235-236; see also *In re Francisco W.* (2006) 139 Cal.App.4th 695, 703 ["Notice to the tribe must include available information about the maternal and paternal grandparents and great-grandparents, including maiden,

married and former names or aliases; birthdates; place of birth and death; current and former addresses; tribal enrollment numbers; and other identifying data”].) Because this case would be subject to reversal to permit compliance with ICWA and corresponding California statutes and rules absent the parties’ stipulation, a stipulated remand advances the interests identified by Code of Civil Procedure section 128, subdivision (a)(8). That is to say, we find the interests of non-parties or the public are not adversely affected by our acceptance of the stipulation and the remand will not erode public trust or reduce the incentive for pretrial settlement. (See *In re Rashad H.*, *supra*, at pp. 379-382; *Union Bank of California v. Braille Inst. of America, Inc.* (2001) 92 Cal.App.4th 1324, 1329-1330.)

DISPOSITION

The juvenile court’s July 31, 2019, order terminating parental rights is conditionally reversed and the matter is remanded to the juvenile court for the limited purpose of demonstrating full compliance with ICWA and related California law.

The juvenile court is directed to re-appoint counsel for Father and Mother and to order DCFS to investigate the parents’ claims of Indian heritage and thereafter comply with notice requirements set forth in ICWA and corresponding California statutes. If proper investigation (to include efforts to interview all known and available paternal and maternal relatives) and required notice (to the Cherokee, Colorado River Indian, Papago, Hopi, and any other relevant tribes as listed on the current Federal Registry) is documented by DCFS and found to have been undertaken by the court, and if no tribe indicates Minor is

an Indian child, the juvenile court shall reinstate the termination of parental rights order. If a tribe asserts Minor is an Indian child, the juvenile court is to proceed in compliance with ICWA and related California provisions. Pursuant to the parties' stipulation, the remittitur shall issue forthwith.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

BAKER, J.

We concur:

RUBIN, P. J.

MOOR, J.