Filed 8/8/12 In re M.H. CA1/4

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

In re M.H., a Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law.	
SAN FRANCISCO HUMAN SERVICES AGENCY, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. MARCUS H., Defendant and Appellant.	A134500 (San Francisco County Super. Ct. No. JD073370)

This court previously denied a petition for extraordinary writ relief filed by appellant Marcus H. (father) after the juvenile court set a permanency planning hearing as to his daughter, M.H. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 366.26). (*Marcus H. v. Superior Court* (May 13, 2011, A131461) [nonpub. opn.].) The juvenile court thereafter terminated father's parental rights, concluding that father had not established that an exception to the termination of parental rights applied. This timely appeal followed.

On June 7, 2012, father's appointed appellate counsel filed a no issues statement in accordance with *In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952 and *In re Phoenix H.* (2009) 47 Cal.4th 835, stating that she had reviewed the record and concluded that there were no arguable issues to raise on appeal. Father wrote to this court on July 3, acknowledging

that he made mistakes early in the proceedings, but stating that he wants to maintain a relationship with the minor.

Although this court has discretion under *In re Sade C.* to conduct an independent review of the record to determine whether there are any arguable issues for briefing, we decline to do so here. The juvenile court's judgment is presumed correct. It is up to appellant to raise claims of reversible error or other defect and present argument and authority on each point made. (*In re Sade C.*, *supra*, 13 Cal.4th at p. 994.) Although father's letter to this court professes heartfelt devotion to the minor, it does not provide any reasoned argument regarding any claim of reversible error or other defect in the juvenile court proceedings. (*Ibid.*) We decline to proceed to consider the merits of the juvenile court's rulings.

The appeal is dismissed.

_____
Sepulveda, J.*

We concur:

_____
Ruvolo, P. J.

_____
Rivera, J.

* Retired Associate Justice of the Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division 4, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.