

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION THREE

L.J.,

Petitioner,

v.

THE SUPERIOR COURT OF HUMBOLDT
COUNTY,

Respondent;

HUMBOLDT COUNTY DEPARTMENT
OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,

Real Party in Interest.

A134132

(Humboldt County

Super. Ct. Nos. JV1001691, JV1001692)

R.J.,

Petitioner,

v.

THE SUPERIOR COURT OF HUMBOLDT
COUNTY,

Respondent;

HUMBOLDT COUNTY DEPARTMENT
OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES,

Real Party in Interest.

A134133

(Humboldt County

Super. Ct. Nos. JV1001691, JV1001692)

The mother and father of E.J. (age three) and L.J. (age two) seek writ review of an order terminating reunification services and setting a permanency planning hearing

pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 366.26.¹ They each argue in separate briefs that the juvenile court erred in finding that reasonable services had been provided and therefore that the court should have continued services to the 12-month hearing. The juvenile court's findings are supported by substantial evidence and therefore we shall deny the petition on the merits.

Background

Two days after L.J. was born in February 2010, an allegation of general neglect was received by the Humboldt County Department of Health and Human Services (the department) and the allegations were later found to be substantiated. After voluntary family maintenance, the department reported that the family was "stabilized." On October 2, 2010, another allegation of general neglect was received and, on November 15, 2010, a petition was filed pursuant to section 300, subdivisions (b) and (g), alleging that mother and father had failed to provide L.J. with adequate food and medical care and that the parents failed to provide adequate medical care to E.J., who was suffering from bottle rot. Mother "reported she was instructed to let the teeth fall out and rot." The petition additionally alleged that father had been physically violent toward mother in the presence of the children, and that father shook L.J. and pushed E.J., causing E.J. to break a tooth. Father could not be located at the time the petition was filed. Mother had left the children with friends who were financially unable to care for them.

The application for protective custody attached to the petition explained that mother had mental health and substance abuse issues that rendered her incapable of caring for the children. On October 8, 2010, mother was living in "an encampment on the Eel River in Fortuna." When a social worker attempted to speak to her, mother denied her identity and moved to a different location. On October 23, mother left the children with friends and left them with a bottle of rotten formula. L.J. was malnourished and underweight, and E.J. exhibited "hoarding behaviors regarding food"

¹ Further statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code.

The children were ordered detained on November 12, 2010, and were removed from the parents' custody on November 16, 2010.

A contested jurisdiction hearing was held on January 10, 2011. The court sustained the petition and set a disposition hearing for January 27. The matter was continued and, on February 28, the department filed a disposition report. The report stated that E.J. had received surgery for her teeth and that her immunizations were up to date. The attached case plan proposed that mother be required to obtain a mental health and medication evaluation and follow the recommendations of the assessment, that she work towards finding suitable housing, that she demonstrate the ability to meet the medical and developmental needs of her children, participate in a minimum of half of her children's medical appointments, engage in parenting classes, not use illegal drugs and submit to regular drug testing. Father was required to obtain a mental health and medication evaluation and follow the recommendations of the assessment, participate in services to learn basic parenting skills including parenting education classes, obtain suitable and sustainable housing, not use illegal drugs and submit to regular drug testing. Mother was provided five hours of supervised visitation weekly, with the possibility that visits might be unsupervised at the discretion of the department and after consulting the children's attorney. Father was not given a visitation schedule because he lived outside of the county and did not have reliable transportation. With seven days' notice, he could arrange for five hours of visitation weekly.

On February 28, an addendum report was filed. Mother had missed 10 visits with the children since December 8, 2010, and had seen them only once since January 14. She had not been in touch with the social worker since that visit. Father had attended a meeting for E.J. concerning special education services.

On March 17, an updated addendum report was filed to address domestic violence and anger management for the parents. It proposed that mother and father be required to complete a domestic violence/anger management program and provide proof of completion to the social worker.

On March 17, the court issued a disposition order, finding that the department had made reasonable efforts to return the children to a safe home, and that the children could not be returned to their parents at that time because of mother's mental health and substance abuse issues and father's inability to protect the children from mother's negligence. Mother and father were ordered to comply with the case plan.

September status report

On September 2, 2011, the department submitted a six-month status review report.² The report stated that mother had been homeless "for the majority of this case." She stayed in a hotel for four weeks in February and March but left because of drug use by her roommates. She stayed in a different hotel from April 20 to June 14, but left because of a conflict with her roommate. She missed visitation with the children for a few weeks when she moved out of the second motel. She missed visitation at another point because she said she was ill with strep throat, but she was unable to produce a letter from a doctor as requested. Mother missed a scheduled meeting with the social worker on June 30. Her last visit with the children had been on June 28, 2011. Father was living outside the area but was able to visit by bus.

It was reported that mother had partially completed her parenting education classes, and that she "did a good job when she attended." Mother was referred to an anger management class but did not follow through, nor had she obtained a mental health evaluation. The social worker asked her to "check in with Open Door clinic on a monthly basis," but mother did not do so. The social worker offered to pay for a parenting/psychological assessment, but mother had not been in contact with the social worker since June 20 to make arrangements for this service. Mother "appeared to be working with numerous housing service providers, but has not yet been successful in meeting this need." She had only accompanied E.J. to one medical appointment. "Barriers to fulfilling this case plan requirement have stemmed mainly from difficulty in

² The report was stamped as received by the court on September 2, and was not filed until November 30.

getting in touch with [mother] and the immediate nature of many medical appointments.” Mother had drug tested four times and all four were positive for marijuana. Mother had a medical marijuana card and told the social worker that she was using it for back pain.

Father had not begun the domestic violence/anger management program because he did not want to pay the \$30 per week cost of the program. He had not obtained a psychological assessment, though the department had agreed to pay for it. According to the status review report, “the only available psychiatrist was on vacation and unavailable in the month of August” Father had made minimal progress in parenting classes. He had signed up for classes, completed an intake and attended five sessions. “The service provider has stated that [father] does not participate in very much discussion and so it is difficult to assess his progress.” Father was in stable housing with his mother. He had not obtained an alcohol and drug abuse assessment.

The September status review report stated that mother had most recently failed to attend visitation on July 25, 2011. She had attended visits regularly in March, April and May and the visits “went well, with [mother] demonstrating adequate parenting skills.” E.J. was unable to attend visits for “weeks at a time” because of a recurrent staph infection. Father visited for two hours every other week, and the children were happy to see him. “While overall the visits go very well, there are concerns that [father] does not always make the best judgment on the playground. For example, he recently left [L.J.] at the top of a tall slide for a moment when he went to help [E.J.] at the bottom of the slide.”

The report stated: “When [mother] is on track with visitation, it is clear that she loves her children and that she has parenting skills. Unfortunately, when [mother] stops attending visits and stops contacting the social worker, she is not able to demonstrate . . . the ability and/or willingness to meet the needs of her children. [Mother] has not been successful in obtaining stable housing or in working with service providers to fulfill the requirements of her case plan. [¶] [Father] is a polite person, who is very consistent in making visitations and in contacting the undersigned social worker. While it is clear that [father] loves his children, there are significant concerns regarding his ability to provide appropriate care to them. [Father] has not made adequate progress with his case plan

requirements. Due to allegations of domestic violence between him and [mother], as well as a criminal conviction in 2004 for causing intentional bodily harm to his stepmother, the case plan required [father] to take part in an anger management program. He has not begun to fulfill this requirement.”

The report concluded, “Based on the parents’ lack of progress with their case plan requirements, there is not a substantial probability of the minors returning to the care of the mother or father by the 12-month review date of 1/10/12.”

A contested six-month review hearing was set for October 17, 2011. The hearing was continued to October 31.

October addendum report

On October 3, an addendum report was received by the court.³ The report states that after two months of no contact, mother had contacted the social worker and “explained that she and her boyfriend now have a phone and have housing on a boat, and that she is ready to continue working on her case plan in order to have her children returned to her. After a visit to the boat by the social worker, it was determined that the boat is not a safe housing option for the children. However, the boat is an opportunity for the mother to have stability while she works to complete the requirements of her case plan.” Mother had completed the intake paperwork at the Humboldt Family Service Center and had scheduled an anger management assessment for October 6. She had a parenting/psychological evaluation scheduled for October 12, and was attending parenting classes. Father had continued to visit the children, but he had not been in contact with the social worker and it was not known whether he had made progress in his case plan.

The social worker noted that mother “is now engaging in her case plan requirements. Extending services to both parents to the 12-month review date on or around 1/10/12 will not cause a placement change or other disruption to the children. The

³ The addendum report is stamped “received” on October 3, but is dated October 5 and was not filed until November 30.

department recommends that family reunification services continue to the mother and to the father.”

Psychological evaluation of mother

On October 12 and 13, 2011, mother was evaluated by a clinical and forensic psychologist, Dr. Renouf. He reported that mother “was often confused, particularly in terms of dates or her age at the time of specific events.” Mother reported physical abuse at the hands of father, which led her to become homeless and camp on the river banks with the children. Dr. Renouf summarized that mother “has a history of trauma, institutional care, domestic violence and homelessness. I consider the results of this evaluation to be incomplete due to [mother’s] defensiveness and suspiciousness in being evaluated. Although there is more to know about her than she revealed, I also did not find indications of serious psychopathology. . . . [¶] . . . [Mother] does suffer from generalized anxiety that is likely to affect her behavior and interactions with others. I suspect that much of her anxiety is the result of childhood trauma, although some is undoubtedly due to her current circumstances. Whatever the source, [mother] is likely to benefit from psychotherapy to help her better manage her anxiety and to improve her social interactions to appropriate levels of trust.” Dr. Renouf noted that there had been a previous diagnosis of bipolar disorder, but that because his evaluation was incomplete he could not evaluate that statement. He also stated that his evaluation of her parenting “was only partial and incomplete.” There were no indications of parenting deficiency, but he was unable to observe her parenting behavior. He recommended parenting classes and stated that a significant barrier for mother was lack of resources.

Prehearing statements

On October 4, 2011, the children’s attorney filed a pretrial statement arguing that she disagreed with the department’s decision to continue providing services. This opinion was based on the asserted fact that mother and father had made no progress on services and that “until recently, mother did not maintain any contact with either the Child Welfare Services or her children.” She argued that “no new information has been

provided to justify the inappropriateness of [the department's] prior recommendation or warrant the changed recommendation. For mother, the addendum simply indicates that after approximately two months, she is now in contact with CWS [child welfare services]. No mention is made regarding mother's compliance or completion of the mandated services. . . . [¶] As to father, not only has he already missed a visit, but it is expressly stated that 'at this time, it is not known if [father] has made any additional progress with his case plan requirements.' Accordingly, there remains no substantial probability that the minors will be returned to mother or father by the 12-month date—about four months away. [¶] These minors are presently aged three and one and should not have their right to permanency be further delayed based only on anticipated or hopeful compliance of the prior court-ordered services. Given mother and father's shown failures to participate regularly and make substantive progress in the court-ordered treatment, we would request that the court terminate further reunification services and schedule a . . . section 366.26 hearing.”

On October 24, the department submitted a pretrial statement recommending that reunification services be extended to both parents until January 10, 2012, or 12 months from the court's initial finding of jurisdiction. The department stated, “The parents have had to deal with several obstacles in order to comply with their case plan. Both parents have struggled with finding and maintaining stable housing and the father has to travel a far distance to visit his children, which he does and has regularly and father has obtained assistance and has gotten into programs out of the area. Mother has complied with the case plan and now has stable housing. Both parents have visited regularly and all of the visits have gone well. The children are reportedly attached to both of their parents and are comfortable in their parents' presence. The department would like the ability to provide the services as outlined in the case plan. Specifically, the department would like the parenting ability evaluations to be completed as to both parents and believes the information obtained will be invaluable in identifying the complete needs of the parents to assist in servicing those needs so that reunification can occur.”

The 6-month review hearing was continued to November 3 and again to November 14. On November 3, the attorney for the children filed a trial brief again arguing that it was in the best interests of the children to terminate reunification services. The brief was based on the September report from the department and noted that as of the date of that report, little to no progress had been made by either of the parents.

On November 7, 2011, the department filed a response to the minor's trial brief again arguing that services should be extended to 12 months. It argued that mother "has substantially complied with every component of her case plan and continues to comply. The mother was unable to visit the children for a period beginning in July 2011, due to her continued struggles with illness, poverty and specifically homelessness. The mother had consistently visited the children prior to July 2011, and all of mother's visits have been appropriate. The mother is able to properly parent her children on the visits and provides them stability and emotional support on these visits. . . . Since the mother has obtained housing, she has consistently and regularly visited the children and all of the visits have gone well. The mother participated in 6 sessions of the 14 session . . . parenting program and has resumed going to the program since September 2011. Mother has successfully incorporated some of her newly learned parenting techniques during the visits with her . . . children. The mother obtained an anger management assessment and a psychological evaluation. The psychological evaluation indicated that mother had appropriate parenting capabilities and could meet the objectives of her case plan and that she could safely parent her children. The evaluation also showed that mother was not in need of psychotropic medication. The evaluation recommended that mother attend individual counseling." The brief noted that mother had trouble attending medical appointments and that "[m]other's homelessness and lack of ability to communicate with mother over some times during the case have also made it difficult. Regardless, the analysis is clear that the mother has continued to meet the obligations of her case plan in a timely fashion and has the ability to reunify with her children."

As to father, the brief states that he "has also been challenged by homelessness and poverty. The father keeps in constant touch with the social worker and has visited

consistently with his children. The father has traveled and stayed overnight locally to assure he makes his visits with his children. The father has obtained the assistance of the social worker and now is signed up and participating in the appropriate programs. All of father's visits have gone well. It is clear father is in need of developing his parenting skills and father's continued participation in his case plan will assist the father in meeting this objective. Any continued assistance provided to the father to help him to become a better parent would clearly be in the children's best interest."

The department's brief concludes by asking the court to "find that the department and the parents have met the burden for the six-month review hearing and in addition find it is in the best interest of the children to extend services to the 12-month date."

Six-month review hearing

On November 16, 2011, a contested six-month review hearing was begun. At the outset of the hearing, the court stated that it "does believe that reasonable services have been offered. That would be subject to any information or evidence that either party would want to present." The court also stated that based on the reports it did not believe the parents had participated regularly in services or made substantial progress.

Mother testified that she attempted to get a mental health evaluation in May and again in June but was turned away by the agencies she approached. She informed her social worker of these problems and asked for her assistance. She did not receive a mental health assessment until she saw Dr. Renouf. She anticipated receiving an assessment to participate in a mental health program on November 30. She testified that she was participating in a parenting program, of which she had six remaining classes out of a total of 28. She testified that she began the program in "January or June, I'm not for sure." She went to six classes at a program in McKinleyville, but it was too far away, so she restarted the program in Eureka. She testified that she had received assistance from the department to obtain sustainable housing in the form of a referral "to the MAC House for me and my fiancée, multiple numbers from RCAA, Humboldt Housing Now, The Switchboard Program; and, um, I've called all of those people. Again, I'm still on the

waiting list.” Mother stated that the social worker has “been trying to help me ever since the case had first started.”

Mother testified that the department had provided her with transportation to attend the children’s medical appointments on one occasion. She had not attended any of L.J.’s appointments. At some point, the children’s foster mother indicated that she was not comfortable having mother attend the children’s medical appointments. Mother spoke with the social worker about this “two or three weeks” before the hearing and the social worker indicated that she was too busy to supervise mother’s attendance at the appointments.

Mother testified that she was not allowed to attend her weekly visitation on one occasion in early May because she had strep throat. Mother went to a hospital for treatment. Mother was told she would not be able to visit again until she got clearance from a doctor. She testified that she tried to locate “the Mobile Medical [but] I couldn’t find them anywhere.” When she asked her social worker for assistance in obtaining medical clearance, the social worker provided her with a number for Mobile Medical. Despite not getting medical clearance, her visits resumed in mid-May.

Mother lost contact with her social worker after July 18 “[b]ecause me and my fiancée had moved to Fortuna to try and find housing.” She did not attempt to contact the social worker because she “[d]id not have a phone to try and contact her.”

Mother acknowledged that she was informed that she had to take a domestic violence/anger management course at the outset of the case, in November 2010. She was provided with a referral to a program by the department approximately three months prior to the six-month review hearing. She was evaluated and told she did not need anger management but that she would benefit from the domestic violence class. Mother attempted to get into one other program in October 2011, but was told that she needed a referral from her social worker. Mother did not seek the department’s assistance to comply with this aspect of her case plan prior to these two attempts.

Father testified that he began a weekly domestic violence/anger management program approximately two years earlier and had only missed two days. He began the

program before the children were detained. He was aware that he was required to get a psychological assessment but had not done so. He had not spoken to the department about getting assistance in doing so. He had not obtained a medication evaluation, though he was aware that he was required to do so as part of his case plan. He had not asked for assistance in obtaining an evaluation. He testified that he was aware that he was required to attend parenting classes and had been doing so in Trinity County for two years, prior to the outset of the case. Again, he testified that he attended weekly and had missed only two classes in two years. He testified that one missed appointment was two weeks prior to the hearing because of an abscessed tooth and the other was four weeks prior to the hearing because his father had knee surgery.

Father testified that he was living with his mother, and that she might or might not be moving to Reno. He was aware of low-income housing that would cost \$695 per month, but he had not obtained an application. His income is \$794 per month and he planned to pay for the apartment by himself.

Father was aware that he had been ordered to complete an alcohol assessment but had not done so because he had been “traveling backwards and forwards” for visitations. He testified that he was traveling every two weeks to visit the children and had missed two appointments approximately four months earlier, once because of an abscessed tooth and once because his father had heart surgery. He had not requested assistance in obtaining an alcohol assessment until a few days prior to the hearing.

Father testified that he had been in constant contact with the department during the case except for a period when he lost his telephone at the zoo. He could not remember when that had occurred, or for how long he had been out of contact. He contacted his social worker only about visitation but did not contact her about obtaining services. He has spoken with the social worker only once since August, the day before the hearing. He could not recall if he had received any information from the department on his case plan requirements, testifying, “I’ve got a bunch of paperwork.” “I’m not for sure. It’s in my folder.”

While the hearing was ongoing, on November 30, 2011, the court appointed special advocates (CASA) advocate filed a report recommending that reunification services be terminated. That report observed that the children were healthy and well-adjusted in their foster home. The report also stated that mother had not attended anger management classes or performed intake assessments for those classes. She had not obtained a mental health assessment and had struggled with maintaining housing. Father had attended five parenting classes, but had not attended or completed intake paperwork for domestic violence/anger management classes and had not obtained a mental health assessment. He had tested positive for marijuana on four occasions. The advocate observed that the children were very young and that “[i]t is CASA’s opinion that another six months of services will not sufficiently prepare either parent to safely care for the children.”

The court concluded that “reasonable services have been offered. I do think that by clear and convincing evidence parents have failed to participate regularly or make substantial progress in the case plan.” The court also stated that it believed that if the parents had “engaged the report when it was first offered, . . . I think there would have been a lot we could do for the mother if this report would have been presented back in the spring. But there is not enough to do in 41 days to be able to provide that.”

The court terminated reunification services and set a permanency planning hearing pursuant to section 366.26. Parents have timely sought review.

Discussion

When a child is removed from a parent’s custody, the juvenile court must order services with the purpose of reunifying the family. (§ 361.5, subd. (a).) Mother and father both argue that the court erred in finding that they were offered reasonable reunification services. Where, as here, the children are under the age of three at the time they are removed from the home, at the six month review hearing the court may terminate reunification services if it finds that the parents failed to make substantial progress in the reunification plan. “The third paragraph of section 366.21, subdivision (e), requires a specialized inquiry at the six-month review for children . . . who are ‘under the age of

three years on the date of the initial removal’ and are not being returned to the custody of their parents at that time. For such dependent children, if ‘the court finds by clear and convincing evidence that the parent failed to participate regularly and make substantive progress in a court-ordered treatment plan, *the court may schedule a hearing pursuant to Section 366.26* within 120 days. If, however, the court finds . . . that reasonable services have not been provided, the court shall continue the case to the 12-month permanency hearing.’ (§ 366.21, subd. (e), italics added.)” (*M.V. v. Superior Court* (2008) 167 Cal.App.4th 166, 175.)

Services are reasonable if the Department has “identified the problems leading to the loss of custody, offered services designed to remedy those problems, maintained reasonable contact with the parents during the course of the service plan, and made reasonable efforts to assist the parents in areas where compliance proved difficult (such as helping to provide transportation . . .).” (*In re Riva M.* (1991) 235 Cal.App.3d 403, 414, italics omitted.) “In reviewing the reasonableness of the services provided, this court must view the evidence in a light most favorable to the respondent. We must indulge in all legitimate and reasonable inferences to uphold the verdict. If there is substantial evidence supporting the judgment, our duty ends and the judgment must not be disturbed. [Citations.] ‘ “[W]hen two or more inferences can reasonably be deduced from the facts,’ either deduction will be supported by substantial evidence, and ‘a reviewing court is without power to substitute its deductions for those of the trial court.’ ” ” (*In re Misako R.* (1991) 2 Cal.App.4th 538, 545.)

The court’s finding regarding services is supported by substantial evidence. Father argues that the department knew he was illiterate but did nothing to accommodate him. He points to the social worker’s testimony that he had called father and sent him paperwork regarding the case plan but that “in retrospect, I’m realizing he might not have been able to read them and understand what they were asking him to do.” The social worker, who did not state when he learned father was illiterate, did confirm that he had verbally reviewed the requirements with father. There is substantial evidence that father did not attempt to perform what was required of him under his case plan, and that his

failure to obtain services relates not to any failing of the department but to his own lack of follow through.

Mother argues that the department should have assisted her in obtaining medical assistance when she had strep throat and that it did not facilitate her efforts to promptly receive an anger management assessment. This in turn delayed her ability to have unsupervised visits. She also contends that the delay in obtaining a mental health assessment was due to the department. At the November 30 hearing the court observed that once the children were in foster care, mother “failed to fully engage. . . . [S]he left for more than 60 days. And when she came back, her only response was: I was in Fortuna looking for a house. Well, Fortuna is just down the road. . . . And the other thing about it is we talk about the MAC Center as an option and how long it takes to get in. But if she would have put her name on the waiting list in November of 2010, even under the worst of circumstances, the nine-month waiting period, we would have had the situation there in a supervised setting that would be able to take place.” The court expressed concern that there had not been additional drug testing of mother in light of her lack of follow through.

The court also relied on Dr. Renouf’s report. “[W]hen you look at Dr. Renouf’s report and you read every single line and every single page, he talks about needing more information to fully evaluate; that he’s concerned about some of the invalidity of those recommendations in the reports; that, certainly, individual therapy may be of benefit to get to the mother and certainly to the children in the long run. But there is no—if the mother can do everything that needed to happen in the last 30 days, then really the question is why didn’t she do it in the first 30 days? Why didn’t she do it before September when the date was there? And how do we really expect it to be fully completed in the next 41 days, because that’s how many days there is between today and January 10th, 2012.” The court continued, “Before mother stopped engaging in services, at best, she was involved as at a mid-level; gone for 50 days and then comes back and makes progress.”

Although the department undoubtedly could have provided more assistance to mother in complying with her case plan, there is substantial evidence that it provided

reasonable services by referring her to an anger management provider and asking her to “check in with Open Door clinic” on a monthly basis and that she had failed to do so. The department provided five hours of supervised visitation weekly, which mother participated in for the most part. There is substantial evidence that mother’s failure to make significant progress was due in large part to the fact that she was not in touch with the social worker or her children for approximately two months during the time that services were being provided and failed to begin services before she lost contact. “In almost all cases it will be true that more services could have been provided more frequently and that the services provided were imperfect. The standard is not whether the services provided were the best that might be provided in an ideal world, but whether the services were reasonable under the circumstances.” (*In re Misako, supra*, 2 Cal.App.4th at p. 547.)

Like so many dependency cases, the situation here is unfortunate and troubling. Both parents care for their two children and have made some efforts to comply with their case plans. Yet, these efforts have been insufficient to correct the conditions that brought the children into the dependency system or to support the reasonable expectation that the conditions will soon be corrected. Substantial evidence supports the conclusion that this failure cannot be attributed to any fault on the part of the social services agency. Given the young age of the two minors, there is a strong public policy to provide the youths with a permanent and stable placement quickly, and not to keep their fates dangling while reunification efforts drag on indefinitely. The difficult and heart-wrenching decisions that the juvenile court made here are based on substantial evidence and comply with the time restrictions imposed by the Legislature. We have no alternative but to affirm those decisions.

Disposition

The petition for extraordinary relief is denied on the merits. (See Cal. Const., art. VI, § 14; *Kowis v. Howard* (1992) 3 Cal.4th 888, 894.) Since the permanency planning

hearing is set for March 19, 2012, our decision is immediately final as to this court. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.490(b)(3).)

Pollak, Acting P.J.

We concur:

Siggins, J.

Jenkins, J.