

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN
AND FAMILY SERVICES

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

FRANCISCO G.,

Defendant and Appellant.

B278763

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. DK19409)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Natalie Stone, Judge. Dismissed.

Daniel G. Rooney, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

Mary C. Wickham, County Counsel, R. Keith Davis,
Assistant County Counsel and Jeanette Cauble, Deputy County
Counsel for Plaintiff and Respondent

The father, Francisco G., has appealed from a jurisdictional order in a dependency proceeding which imposed certain conditions on his custody of his two children, K.G. and F.G. The Department of Children and Family Services has moved to dismiss his appeal on mootness grounds. We agree the appeal is moot and order its dismissal.

On October 17, 2016, the adjudication and dispositional hearings were held. The Welfare and Institutions Code section 300 dependency petition was sustained in part. The father was given custody of the children but was required to live with the maternal grandmother, Teresa R. The father appealed from that part of the dispositional order which required he reside in the home of the maternal grandmother and other related conditions.

On November 1, 2016, the department filed a Welfare and Institutions Code section 342 subsequent petition which alleges the father violated various conditions of the October 17, 2016 dispositional order. On January 5, 2017, the subsequent petition as amended was sustained. The children were removed from the father's custody and he was granted monitored visitation.

The department has moved to dismiss the father's appeal as moot. The October 17, 2016 dispositional order placed the children with the father subject to conditions to which he objected. The January 5, 2017 subsequent petition order removed the children entirely from his custody and granted him visitation rights. Thus, all of the father's contentions in the

present appeal are now moot as there is no effectual relief we can provide him. (*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 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.