

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115(a).

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION THREE

In re A.W., A Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND
FAMILY SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

C.W.,

Defendant and Appellant.

B267963

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. DK06048)

Appeal from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,
Teresa T. Sullivan, Judge. Appeal dismissed.

Law Office of Marissa Coffey and Marissa Coffey, under appointment by the
Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance by Plaintiff and Respondent.

No appearance by father, D.W.

In this appeal, mother C.W. challenges the trial court's October 1, 2015 order denying her request to terminate dependency jurisdiction over her son A.W., and her further request to issue an order awarding her sole legal and physical custody of A.W. However, on February 24, 2016, during the pendency of this appeal, the court terminated dependency jurisdiction over A.W. and issued an order awarding mother sole legal and physical custody of A.W. Mother advised this court that her appeal is now moot. (See letter from counsel Marissa Coffey filed March 7, 2016.)

The Department of Children and Family Services indicated it would not appear as a respondent in mother's appeal. (See letter filed March 3, 2016.) However, because father Dave W. would have been prejudiced by a reversal of the court's October 1, 2015 order, we ordered the appointment of appellate counsel for him. (See order dated March 18, 2016.) Father's counsel indicated father will not file a respondent's brief in this appeal. (See letters from counsel Daniel G. Rooney filed April 5, 2016 and April 7, 2016.)

We have taken judicial notice of the court's February 24, 2016 order pursuant to Evidence Code section 452, subdivision (d), and agree with mother that the appeal is moot. (See order of this date granting appellant's request for judicial notice.) We therefore dismiss the appeal. (See *In re Dani R.* (2001) 89 Cal.App.4th 402, 404 [“ ‘[A]n action that originally was based on a justiciable controversy cannot be maintained on appeal if all the questions have become moot by subsequent acts or events. A reversal in such a case would be without practical effect, and the appeal will therefore be dismissed’ ”].)

DISPOSITION

The appeal is dismissed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

LAVIN, J.

WE CONCUR:

EDMON, P. J.

ALDRICH, J.