

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

In re M.F., a Person Coming  
Under the Juvenile Court Law.

B283384

LOS ANGELES COUNTY  
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN  
AND FAMILY SERVICES,

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. DK17620)

Plaintiff and Respondent,

ORDER OF DISMISSAL

v.

KATRINA K.,

Defendant and Appellant.

THE COURT:

Katrina K., the mother of three-year-old M.F. (Minor), appeals from a series of juvenile court orders. We dismiss the appeal pursuant to *In re Phoenix H.* (2009) 47 Cal.4th 835, 843, 866, and *In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952, 994.

### 1. *The Juvenile Court Proceedings*

In 2016, the juvenile court declared Minor a dependent child of the court under Welfare and Institutions Code<sup>1</sup> section 300, subdivision (b) and removed him from Mother's custody. We affirmed the jurisdictional and dispositional orders on appeal, as well as the juvenile court's refusal to appoint a specific person as Minor's guardian. (*In re M.F.* (Nov. 6, 2017, B277535, B280849) [nonpub. opn.] )

On May 12, 2017, the juvenile court denied Mother's section 388 petition requesting that Minor be placed with Mother's friend. The court placed Minor with his paternal aunt, issued a "do not remove" order, directed the aunt to obtain vaccinations for Minor, and assigned Minor's educational and developmental rights to her. Mother was granted monitored visitation. The juvenile court also denied Mother's motion to dismiss. The court continued the six-month review hearing at Mother's request so that she could obtain private counsel.

On May 26, 2017, at Mother's request, the juvenile court again continued the six-month review hearing to June 6, 2017, so that she could obtain private counsel. The court also suspended Mother's visitation and telephone contact with Minor because Mother had made threats to Minor's caregiver.

### 2. *Mother's Appeals*

On May 12, 2017, Mother filed a notice of appeal that stated that she appealed all the findings and orders of the court on May 12, 2017, as well as "all 2016-2017." She filed a notice of

---

<sup>1</sup> All further statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code.

appeal on May 26, 2017, appealing the court's findings and orders made that day and in 2016-2017.

After examining the record, appellate counsel advised this court in writing that there are no arguable issues in this matter. (See *In re Phoenix H.*, *supra*, 47 Cal.4th at p. 845 [“[c]ounsel appointed to represent an indigent parent on appeal from a ruling affecting parental rights does not have an obligation to challenge the judgment if there is no colorable basis for such a challenge”].) Appellate counsel notified Mother of counsel's evaluation of the matter and advised her she could request permission from this court to file a supplemental brief upon a showing of good cause that an arguable issue exists. (*Id.* at pp. 844-845 [if appointed counsel files a brief raising no issues on behalf of an indigent parent in a dependency action, the appellate court has discretion to permit the parent to personally file a brief].)

On January 17, 2018, Mother submitted a motion for leave to file supplemental briefing in which she asserted that: the juvenile court erred by signing a case plan on August 11, 2016; her counsel did not give her documentation prior to a hearing on April 5, 2017; the court erroneously denied her section 388 petition on May 12, 2017; DCFS failed to provide relevant information pertaining to that section 388 petition to the court; Minor should not have been placed with his paternal aunt; the court should have granted Mother's motion to dismiss and it improperly denied her the opportunity to address the court; the court denied Mother her right to cross-examine social workers; the social workers' reports were not accurate and should not have been the basis for the court's decisions; and her counsel failed to provide her with reports and neglected his duties. Mother

additionally posed questions to the court concerning dependency court jurisdiction and purpose, the removal of children from their parents' custody, the best interests of children, and the rights of poor people to rest and secure their belongings.

We do not doubt the sincerity of Mother's love for Minor. However, the letter brief does not identify any legally cognizable error in the juvenile court's orders. Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed. (*In re Phoenix H.*, *supra*, 47 Cal.4th at pp. 843, 846; *In re Sade C.*, *supra*, 13 Cal.4th at p. 994.)

---

PERLUSS, P. J.