

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN
AND FAMILY SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

DANIELLE V.,

Defendant and Appellant.

B286204

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. DK19068)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Robert S. Wada, Juvenile Court Referee. Affirmed.

Deborah Dentler, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

Mary C. Wickham, County Counsel, Kristine Miles, Acting Assistant County Counsel, and David Michael Miller, Deputy County Counsel, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Danielle V. appeals from the juvenile court's August 9, 2017 jurisdiction findings and disposition order concerning her son, J.D., contending substantial evidence did not support the court's finding it had no reason to know J.D. was an Indian child as defined by the Indian Child Welfare Act. Danielle argues the finding was based on "an apparently inaccurate assertion" by counsel for the Los Angeles County Department of Children and Family Services at the jurisdiction hearing "that notices to Indian tribes had been mailed by first-class mail to tribes, and that no responses to those notices had been received for more than sixty days from the date of mailing." Danielle argues there are no copies of any notices or mail receipts in the record to support assertion by counsel for the Department that the notices were mailed.

Along with its respondent's brief, however, the Department filed a motion to augment the record with numerous documents filed in the juvenile court, which we granted. These documents show that in February 2017 the Department filed copies of the notices it sent to, and confirmations of their receipt by, the tribes referred to by counsel for the Department: Apache Tribe Oklahoma, Fort Sill Apache Tribe, Jicarilla Apache Nation, Jicarilla Apache Indians, Mescalero Apache Tribe, San Carlos Apache Tribe, Tonto Apache Tribe, White Mountain Apache Tribe, Yavapai-Apache Nation, Cherokee Nation, United Keetowah Band of Cherokee Indians, Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, Ute Indian Tribe, Ute Mountain Ute Tribe (Colorado and Utah), and Utu Utu Gwaitu Paiute Tribe.

Danielle does not contend, and the record does not reflect, the Department received anything but negative responses to the

notices. Danielle has not filed a reply brief. Because her argument lacks merit, we affirm.

SEGAL, J.

We concur:

PERLUSS, P. J.

FEUER, J.