

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN
AND FAMILY SERVICES

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

L.P.,

Defendant and Appellant.

B277597

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. DK14720)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los
Angeles County, Robin R. Kesler, Referee. Dismissed.

Janette Freeman Cochran, under appointment by the Court
of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

Mary C. Wickham, County Counsel, R. Keith Davis,
Assistant County Counsel and Tracey M. Blount, Deputy County
Counsel for Plaintiff and Respondent

The mother, Lidia P., 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.

On July 28, 2016, the juvenile court issued the dispositional order. The juvenile court ordered the child, Jade G., removed from the mother's custody. The court ordered the child be in the mother's home. On January 30, 2017, the juvenile court terminated jurisdiction and ordered the child returned to the mother's custody. We agree 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.) The argument that the orders in this case may have "sever and unfair" consequences in future dependency litigation is speculative. There is no merit to the mother's argument the appeal is not moot because she may once again in the future be the subject to dependency litigation.

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NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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.