

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

DENISE R.,

Petitioner,

v.

THE SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS
ANGELES COUNTY,

Respondent;

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND
FAMILY SERVICES,

Real Party in Interest.

B262707

(Los Angeles County Super. Ct.
No. CK94846)

ORIGINAL PROCEEDINGS; petition for extraordinary writ. Stephen Marpet,
Commissioner. Denied.

Law Office of Marlene Furth, Melissa A. Chaitin, Tiffany Poncy, for Petitioner.

No appearance for Respondent.

Mark J. Saladino, County Counsel, Dawyn R. Harrison, Assistant County Counsel,
Kim Nemoy, Principle Deputy County Counsel, for Real Party in Interest.

Denise R. (mother) seeks extraordinary writ review of an order removing her children from her custody and setting a termination of parental rights hearing. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 366.26.)¹ Mother contends the dependency court erred in denying her counsel's request to continue the disposition hearing and then terminating her reunification services. Given the record in this case, we conclude the court's denial of a continuance and subsequent termination of mother's reunification services was not an abuse of discretion. We therefore deny the petition.

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Original Proceedings

The family has a referral history dating back to 2008, which includes five prior referrals. The referrals alleged mother and William R. would yell at each other in the presence of the children, and the children are being emotionally abused. They also alleged the children are often left unsupervised and the family is living in "deplorable conditions." All of the referrals were investigated and deemed either unfounded or inconclusive.

On August 1, 2012, the Los Angeles Department of Children and Family Services (Department) initiated dependency proceedings on behalf of D.R.² (born on April 8, 1999), E.R. (born on July 28, 2002), and W.R. (born on September 16, 2005). The Department responded after receiving a referral on July 23, 2012, alleging that mother is volatile, angry, and hits the children. There were also allegations that mother was a

¹ All references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code, unless otherwise stated.

² D.R. is not a subject of this proceeding as dependency jurisdiction was terminated over her and she was returned to the sole legal and physical custody of her father, Cain P.

hoarder and refused to let anyone into her home for years, including social workers, and that the city code enforcement officials had been to the home because of its unsanitary and hazardous condition. William, father of E.R. and W.R., used to reside in the home but has since moved out. There is a history of domestic violence between William and mother. William was convicted of misdemeanor spousal abuse in 2007.

A social worker and police officer arrived at mother's home to investigate. On approach to the door the social worker smelled a foul odor of animal urine and feces. The social worker knocked on the door, but no one answered. E.R. and D.R. eventually opened the door and told the social worker that mother was at work, but they did not know how to reach her. The social worker obtained mother's work number and contacted her. Mother denied her children were home alone. After the social worker told mother that she needed to come home, mother abruptly hung up the phone. Mother finally returned home after the social worker took the children into protective custody. According to the police, mother began to throw big rocks at a neighbor's home. The police placed mother on a psychiatric hold.

The Department detained the children. The court released D.R. to Cain and ordered E.R. and W.R. detained from their parents' custody and placed with Cain as well.

D.R. told the social worker that mother was depressed and would yell at her if she threw anything away. E.R. and D.R. had allergies and W.R. had asthmas, all of which was exacerbated by the condition of the home. It appeared that D.R. had the burden of childcare responsibilities and presented as a parental figure to her siblings. D.R. did not want to visit mother and was adamant that none of the children should be returned home. D.R. and E.R. also confirmed witnessing domestic violence between mother and William, where he "pound[ed] on mother while mother was on the floor." The violence was triggered by his consumption of alcohol. D.R. disclosed that mother had hit E.R. with a dust pan, sprayed her with a water hose on full blast, and then made her stay outside while wet until nightfall. Regarding the home, D.R. reported she would get ill from the rotten food she was forced to eat because mother would not throw anything away. E.R. said mother would tell the children not to talk to the social workers, warning if they did

the children would be taken away. E.R. reported mother told her she hated E.R. and only wanted W.R. back. E.R. did not want to visit mother or talk to her, she just wanted mother to improve the condition of the home. W.R. confirmed mother's physical abuse towards him and that the home was filthy. None of the children knew how to properly bathe or clean themselves, and W.R. presented with a possible infection on his foreskin.

The Department filed a dependency petition pursuant to section 300, subdivisions (a), (b), and (j), concerning mother's three children. The Department alleged mother physically abused both E.R. and W.R. on multiple occasions, and mother and William have a history of engaging in violent altercations in the children's presence. On July 23, 2012, and on prior occasions, mother placed the children in an endangering and detrimental situation by leaving the home alone without adult supervision. Furthermore, the Department alleged mother has mental and emotional problems which render her unable to provide regular care and supervision of the children. On July 23, 2012, mother was involuntarily hospitalized for the evaluation and treatment of her psychiatric condition. Lastly, mother established a filthy, unsanitary, and hazardous home environment for the children, so much so that the city's code enforcement was currently investigating her home.

The court found a prima facie case for detaining the children. The court ordered the Department to provide mother with referrals for parenting, individual counseling, and for a mental health evaluation.

Mother exhibited inappropriate behavior during her monitored visitation and was emotional abusive toward the children. During the first visit, mother could not refrain from making negative comments about Cain. The second visit ended quickly because of mother's behavior. The third visit lasted only 30 minutes. Mother told D.R. that Cain wanted to abort her and then told her, "You're dead to me." Mother also called Cain's home and threatened to burn his house down. After another visit, W.R. told Cain that mother threatened to kill Cain. After Cain cancelled a visit because the children were ill, mother called the police and made false reports of abuse. During a subsequent visit, mother started to disparage Cain and grabbed D.R. to prevent her from leaving. The

children were experiencing significant emotional trauma as a result of the visitation with mother which was evidenced by W.R.'s tantrums and E.R. nightmares after visits.

In August 2012, mother began weekly individual counseling sessions with Dr. Robert L. Lark. Dr. Lark reported to the Department that mother was doing "great" in treatment, but he was "unwilling to provide the [D]epartment with any information regarding mother's participation in individual counseling to which he stated 'she is doing great.'" In January 2013, Dr. Lark was provided with copies of the Department's reports, but he did not appear to know the allegations against mother or any of the Department's concerns.

On September 26, 2012, the Department filed an amended petition pursuant to section 300, subdivisions (a), (b), (c), and (j), concerning all three children. In addition to the original allegations, the Department alleged mother physically abused D.R., and William physically abused E.R. on multiple occasions. William also has a history of alcohol abuse, which renders him incapable of providing regular care and supervision of the children.

At the March 1, 2013 adjudication hearing, the court declared the children dependents of the court under section 300, subdivisions (b) and (j), finding true: that mother physically and emotionally abused D.R. and E.R.; mother would leave the children home alone without appropriate adult supervision; mother and William engaged in verbal and physical altercations in the presence of the children; and the family home was so filthy and hazardous that city inspectors investigated the home due to mother's hoarding. The court terminated dependency jurisdiction over D.R. and granted Cain sole legal and physical custody of her. The court removed E.R. and W.R. from parental custody and ordered the Department to provide reunification services for mother and William. The court ordered mother to participate and complete individual counseling, conjoint counseling, parenting classes, anger management, a mental health evaluation, and monitored visitation.

According to a progress report prepared by Dr. Lark on May 14, 2013, mother was fully participating in all of her individual counseling sessions and has demonstrated a

thorough understating of why she is in counseling. Dr. Lark reported that “mother has developed an awareness, acceptance, correctness of self-concept. Mother evidences empathetic awareness and experiences genuine remorse for past behaviors.” Mother had completed 10 weekly sessions of a parent education program for parents with special concerns and a 12-week program in anger management. Dr. Lark conducted a mental health evaluation for mother and diagnosed her with adjustment disorder with mixed emotions/anxiety.

E.R. and W.R. were initially placed with Cain but due to the distance between the children’s placement and parents’ home, the parents requested that the children be replaced. The court ordered the children placed in the home of their godparents in June 2013. The Department reported the children initially had a difficult time adjusting to their new environment. E.R. and W.R. strongly expressed a desire to remain placed with Cain and their sibling, D.R..

Mother and William continued to reside together. Since this case was brought to the attention of the Department, the parents did not allow social workers to enter the home and therefore it was unknown as to the living condition. Mother continued to be seen by her therapist, Dr. Lark, who indicated that she has been consistent with her weekly sessions. Although mother provided the Department with proof of completion of her programs, she had not demonstrated her ability to control her anger.

On August 30, 2013, the court convened for the six-month review hearing. The Department reported mother had completed 43 individual counseling sessions. On August 13, 2013, Dr. Lark informed a social worker that mother was doing well, “but did not go into details about her progress.” When the social worker shared with Dr. Lark concerns regarding William’s disclosure of mother’s anger outbursts throughout this case and verbal abuse towards him, Dr. Lark stated that he was not aware of this behavior and that mother has not shared these incidents with him. The court ordered the Department to prepare and submit therapist reports before the contested hearing on November 15, 2013.

At the November 15, 2013 contested hearing, the Department reported the children’s visits with their parents had improved markedly since the Department began

working with the family in August 2012. “The children now look forward to visits with their parents and run to hug and kiss their mom and dad.” A social worker finally visited the residence in October 2013 after two prior appointments failed to come to fruition. The house was “still filled with stacks of boxes and bags in every corner and on every table surface. The residence was, to put it gently, very cluttered.” “Outside of the house revealed the full extent and seriousness of the hoarding issue—which presents both a safety and potential health hazard and would not be an appropriate environment for the children” The court ordered the Department to continue to provide the parents family reunification services until the February 3, 2014 permanency hearing. The Department was directed to assist in setting up family counseling for the parents and children, and to inspect the parents’ home as to the appropriateness of visits and possible return.

At the December 9, 2013 progress hearing, the Department reported the interior and grounds of the home are not appropriate for the children to visit or to return home. “There is a continu[ed] concern that [mother] might lose her temper again and/or say or do something inappropriate and hurtful to her children, either in continuing unsupervised visits or in conjoint session with the children.” Mother’s “interactions during monitored visits have improved dramatically in the past [four] months, but this improvement occurred in the context of repeated and serious admonishments and corrections by [the Department] monitors, and warnings that future violations would result in immediate ending of the visit.”

At the February 3, 2014 permanency hearing, the Department reported mother canceled a schedule visit to her home to review progress on cleaning and clearing the property. Mother stated that the social worker would not be permitted to come to her home in the future as well. Mother had not been seen by her therapist, Dr. Lark, since November 2013, because she lost her job and it was difficult paying the weekly \$10 co-payments for therapy. However, mother had not informed the Department that she is no longer participating in therapy. The children remain placed with their godparents and have adjusted “very positively to their current placement.” The Department concluded

the parents have completed many case plan activities but in actual interactions with the children, “mother . . . still engages in destructive behaviors and . . . William . . . has also engaged in harmful actions as well, such as violating visiting rules by taking the children to their home and telling the children not to tell anyone.” The Department could not recommend the children return home and given the statutory time limits for reunification had expired, it recommended terminating reunification services. The court set a contested permanency hearing as to the recommendation to termination parents’ reunification services and the setting of a permanent planning hearing.

At the May 5, 2014 contested hearing, the Department reported conjoint therapy sessions have been instrumental in improving communication between E.R. and mother. The parents are also “providing empathy toward W.R. and have demonstrated the capacity to empathize with the children, and to create a safe place for the children to express their feelings.” A social worker visited mother’s home on two occasions and found dramatic improvement in the condition of each room. “The premises are now ready for the children to live in safely and comfortably.” During a home visit on February 13, 2014, mother told a social worker she was not going to therapy. The social worker immediately offered mother a referral for no-cost therapy, which mother refused. Mother stated, “I already went to a year and a half. I should think that was enough.” Mother displayed a continued pattern of passive-aggressive behavior towards the social worker during the home visit and always towards E.R. during monitored visitation. The court ordered the children placed back in the parents’ home under the supervision of the Department. The Department was ordered to provide the children and parents family maintenance services.

In a July 30, 2014 interim review report, the Department reported the family is continuing to participate in individual, conjoint and family therapy, although family therapy has been temporarily suspended. The children’s psychiatric treatment had been cancelled by the parents. Mother’s stress level fluctuated since the children returned home. William had been laid-off and mother was working full-time and sometimes working overtime. E.R. felt overwhelmed, hopeless, and that she is in an “activated”

state and needs “medication support.” On July 27, 2014, mother reported to the Department that William was “becoming increasingly abusive,” and believed that he was drinking again. The Department had William tested on demand that afternoon and the results were negative. William and the children denied any abusive behavior or alcohol use. The court ordered the children to see their therapist weekly and to take all prescribed medications. The court further ordered mother to remain in counseling, to be seen by a psychiatrist and “refrain from making any derogatory statements about the children or about [William] in the children’s presence.” The court set a progress hearing on September 8, 2014, to allow the Department to address how the services for the children and mother are progressing. The court noted that it “is very concerned regarding the ability of the mother to take care of the children.”

In August 2014, the Department conducted a Team Decision-Making Meeting to discuss the court’s orders and the family’s compliance with these orders. The family was making progress, parents were attending conjoint counseling and the children continued individual therapy. However, mother remained negative and defensive, specifically when the social worker discussed mother meeting with a psychiatrist. On three different occasions, mother met with her old therapist, Dr. Lark, who “strongly encouraged her to take psychotropic medication, to go to a medical doctor if she could not make arrangements to see a psychiatrist and to get a prescription and take the medication.” Dr. Lark told mother, “Unless you go on medication, I don’t think you’re going to be able to see your children.” He also told mother “that she had not grown at all since he last saw her a year ago and pointed out that she is still blaming everyone.” Mother had not yet made an appointment to see a psychiatrist.

At the September 22, 2014 progress hearing, the court ordered the parents “to not make inappropriate comment’s [*sic*] in front of the children, and to attend all medical/therapeutic appointments.”

Subsequent Petition

The Department received a five-day referral, alleging emotional and physical abuse of E.R. and W.R. by William. On September 27, 2014, at approximately 1:50 a.m., William had arrived home from work intoxicated, grabbed a large kitchen knife, and threatened to kill himself and E.R.. He also threatened to beat the children to death with a metal bat. When mother returned home from work, E.R. told her what transpired and mother called the police. William was placed on a psychiatric hold for being a danger to himself and others. Mother reported a history of domestic violence and substance abuse by William dating back to 2007 to 2008. Mother stated that William is “extremely violent” and “mentally unstable” when he is drunk. William maintained he was sober for about four years and had relapsed by drinking several pints of vodka.

On October 3, 2014, mother filed a request for a restraining order against William, which was granted until a court hearing on October 28, 2014. William was ordered to stay 100 yards away from mother, E.R. and W.R..

Despite many efforts to gain access to the home, mother refused to answer the door even though it appeared she was home. The city’s code enforcement had a current open case on the home due to building issues and property maintenance.

On October 10, 2014, the Department filed a subsequent petition under section 342³ on behalf of E.R. and W.R. against both mother and William for failure to protect (§ 300, subd. (b)). The new petition alleged in count b-1 that William has a history of alcohol abuse, was under the influence while both children were in William’s care, and mother knew or reasonable should have known about William’s alcohol abuse and failed to protect them. On September 27, 2014, and on prior occasions, William was under the

³ Section 342 states in pertinent part: “In any case in which a minor has been found to be a person described by Section 300 and the [Department] alleges new facts or circumstances, other than those under which the original petition was sustained, sufficient to state that the minor is a person described in Section 300, the [Department] shall file a subsequent petition.”

influence of alcohol while the children were in William's care and supervision.

William's alcohol abuse coupled with "mother's failure to protect the children endangers the children's physical health and safety, creates a detrimental home environment and places the children at risk of physical harm, damage, danger and failure to protect." The petition in count b-2 alleged that William has mental and emotional problems, including a diagnosis of depressive disorder, generalized anxiety disorder, alcohol dependence, suicidal and homicidal ideations, which rendered him unable to provide regular care for the children. On September 27, 2014, William brandished a knife at E.R. and threatened to kill himself and E.R.. William also threw a metal bat toward E.R.. On a prior occasion, William was hospitalized for evaluation and treatment for his psychiatric condition. William's mental and emotional condition "endangers the children's physical health and safety, and places the children at risk of physical harm, damage and danger."

The court authorized the Department to detain the children from William's custody but permitted them to remain with mother. The court ordered the Department to continue to provide mother appropriate family maintenance services helping her to take care of her children. On October 28, 2014, the court granted the temporary restraining order keeping William away from both mother and the children. The order was to remain in effect until November 7, 2014.

On November 7, 2014, the Department filed its first amended section 342 petition adding count b-3 against mother, alleging that mother has a history of mental and emotional problems, and failed to follow the court's orders to obtain a psychiatric evaluation and mental health services which renders her unable to provide regular care and supervision of the children. Mother has failed to show up to six no cost mental health services appointments and as a result, mother has not been evaluated for medication. Further, mother continued to be unable to control her emotions, making demeaning and inappropriate comments about William to the children despite a court order prohibiting such conduct. Mother's mental and emotional condition endangers the children's physical health and safety and places the children at risk of physical harm and damage.

The court authorized a removal order and the Department detained the children from mother's custody, placing them back with Cain. The court ordered the Department to provide the parents with appropriate family reunification serviced based on the allegations raised in the section 342 petition. The court continued the matter to January 16, 2015, for adjudication on the section 342 petition and for a judicial review hearing under section 364.

The Department reported to the court that mother had not attempted to call the children since their detention and failed to confirm a scheduled visit, so it did not occur. The children disclosed that mother told them, among other things, that Cain started the Department case that resulted in the children's initial detention from mother; that Cain did this only because he wanted to get D.R. away from mother; that the only reason Cain took care of E.R. and W.R. was "because of the money"; and that Cain "gave back" E.R. and W.R. because he already had D.R., who was the one he really wanted.

Mother reported to the Department that she is currently attending therapy with Dr. Lark and had attended one appointment with a psychiatrist, Dr. Jairo Gomez. However, mother failed to sign a release of information allowing the Department to verify the appointment with Dr. Gomez and his information. A social worker reminded mother that she was to notify the Department of the contact information for her treating psychiatrist prior to the appointment, so that the Department could provide the psychiatrist with the court reports. Mother has yet to receive a psychiatric evaluation for appropriateness of medication, comply with psychiatric treatment or attend weekly individual counseling despite a court order. Although mother had made some effort by enrolling in individual counseling with Dr. Lark, she did so with a therapist who previously indicated that she needed a medication evaluation. Mother eventually provided the Department with a signed release of information for Dr. Gomez, however, the Department has not received a return phone call from him.

On January 16, 2015, the adjudication hearing was continued to March 6, 2015, because the Department's counsel was sick. The court continued the section 364 hearing as well.

At the March 6, 2015 adjudication hearing, the court received multiple reports by the Department into evidence without objection. The court then asked all counsel whether they had any witnesses. All counsel, including mother's, replied "no." In closing argument, mother's counsel requested that if the court were to find the allegations true against mother that the disposition hearing be continued to enable counsel to make a stronger argument in favor of returning the children to mother's custody. "I do think I would like to hear from Dr. Lark. I think subpoenaing this Dr. Gomez to find out what evaluation has actually been done and what his recommendations are would be helpful, as well as a current assessment of mother's home would be all helpful for this court in making a decision as to whether or not there really is clear and convincing evidence to keep these children out of the home of the mother."

The court sustained the section 342 in its amended form as to counts b-1 and b-3, but struck count b-2. Regarding disposition, the court stated "we just run out of time and there's a continued risk to return these two children. And, mother has not complied fully with the case plan to allow this court to find that there is no risk and there is a continued risk, so the court . . . is finding that services have been provided, reunification, family maintenance services for over two and one-half years well beyond the statutory time limits." The court then terminated the parents' services and referred the matter for a section 366.26 hearing to select and implement a permanent, out-of-home plan for the children for June 29, 2015.

Mother filed a timely notice of intent to file a writ petition.⁴

⁴ The children's respective fathers are not parties to this writ proceeding.

DISCUSSION

Continuance

Mother contends that the court erred in denying her counsel's request for a continuance and proceeding to disposition without considering all of the relevant evidence. Mother contends testimony of her treating therapist, Dr. Lark, and her psychiatrist, Dr. Gomez, as well as an updated assessment of her home were vital in determining whether the children should be removed from her custody. We conclude the court's denial of a continuance was not an abuse of discretion.

A continuance of any dependency court hearing shall be granted only upon a showing of good cause, and shall not be granted if contrary to the minor's best interests. (§ 352, subd. (a).) "In considering the minor's interests, the court shall give substantial weight to a minor's need for prompt resolution of his or her custody status, the need to provide children with stable environments, and the damage to a minor of prolonged temporary placements." (*Ibid.*) Continuances should not be granted lightly, but instead should be difficult to obtain. (*Jeff M. v. Superior Court* (1997) 56 Cal.App.4th 1238, 1242; *In re Emily L.* (1989) 212 Cal.App.3d 734, 743.) Moreover, if a minor has been removed from the parents' custody, no continuances may be granted that would result in the dispositional hearing being completed longer than 60 days after the detention hearing, unless the court finds that there are *exceptional circumstances* requiring such a continuance. (§ 352, subd. (b), italics added.)

Here, the detention hearing was held on November 7, 2014. The March 6, 2015 jurisdiction and disposition hearing was already beyond the 60 days contemplated under section 352, subdivision (b), and mother's counsel demonstrated no exceptional circumstances warranting a further continuance. Mother does not specifically indicate what further information she sought to elicit from Dr. Lark or Dr. Gomez, nor does she claim that the Department's reports about her treatment were inaccurate. According to the Department's most recent assessment by Dr. Lark, he told mother, "Unless you go on

medication, I don't think you're going to be able to see your children.” He also told mother “that she had not grown at all since he last saw her a year ago and pointed out that she is still blaming everyone.” After mother eventually provided the Department with a signed release of information for Dr. Gomez, the Department has yet to receive a return phone call from him. Moreover, mother had ample time to call the two witnesses and request an updated assessment as the case was most-recently continued from January 16, 2015, due to the absence of the Department's counsel. Mother fails to address how an updated assessment would have benefited her. Since the subsequent petition was filed, mother continued to refuse to allow social workers into her home and the city's code enforcement still has a pending case on the home due to mother's hoarding. Mother makes no argument as to how she has improved the condition of her home or made significant progress in her therapy sessions. In sum, this record cannot support a finding the dependency court abused its discretion by denying mother's request for a continuance. (See *In re Karla C.* (2003) 113 Cal.App.4th 166, 180 [dependency court's “denial of a request for continuance will not be overturned on appeal absent an abuse of discretion” and discretion is abused “when a decision is arbitrary, capricious or patently absurd and results in a manifest miscarriage of justice”].)

Reunification Services

Mother contends the court erred in termination her reunification services and then setting the matter for a permanency hearing “without giving any party an opportunity to be heard.” We conclude the court did not abuse its discretion in terminating mother's reunification services.

When a minor is removed from a parent's custody on an original petition, the court must order reunification services for as long as 18 months after the minor's removal. (§ 361.5, subd. (a).) These services may be extended beyond this 18-month period if the department has, in the court's opinion, failed to make a reasonable effort to provide these services during this time. (*In re Daniel G.* (1994) 25 Cal.App.4th 1205,

1213-1214; see *In re Dino E.* (1992) 6 Cal.App.4th 1768, 1777-1778.) When a minor has been declared a dependent child and the Department alleges new facts or circumstances sufficient to find that the minor should be found to be a dependent child, the Department files a subsequent petition, alleging the new information. By statute, all procedures and hearings required for an original petition also apply to a subsequent petition. (§ 342; *Kimberly R. v. Superior Court* (2002) 96 Cal.App.4th 1067, 1075.)

“When the court later considers a subsequent petition alleging additional bases of dependency jurisdiction, further reunification services are not required in all cases. Failure to order additional reunification services after finding jurisdiction on a subsequent petition constitutes reversible error only if the particular facts of the case demonstrate an abuse of discretion in failing to order additional services. Key factors in this determination would be whether the services already offered were adequate, whether they addressed the concerns raised by the subsequent petition, and whether the objectives of the reunification plan—the reunification of the family—could be achieved with the provision of additional services. (See § 361.5, subd. (a).)” (*In re Barbara P.* (1994) 30 Cal.App.4th 926, 934.)

The case before us is not a case that would benefit from additional services. The Department provided mother reunification services for over two and a half years, yet mother has not made significant progress. Mother’s hoarding, emotional abuse and refusal to engage in services has continued throughout the pendency of the case. Mother fails to make an argument that the services provided by the Department were inadequate. Additionally, the new allegations based on mother’s failure to protect the children due to William’s alcohol abuse and mother’s history of mental illness would not have necessitated new and different reunification services. We conclude the court did not abuse its discretion in terminating reunification services as to mother.

DISPOSITION

Mother's petition for extraordinary writ relief is denied.

KRIEGLER, J.

We concur:

TURNER, P. J.

MOSK, J.