

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

PATRICIA GOHLESTON,  
Plaintiff and Appellant,

v.

RAVANOUR GOHLESTON,  
Defendant and Respondent.

A141017

(Alameda County  
Super. Ct. No. RF08425091)

Patricia Gohleston appeals from a January 31, 2014 judgment of dissolution, a default proceeding (Fam. Code, § 2336) in which her former husband, Ravanour Gohleston, apparently never appeared.

In the abbreviated argument in her opening brief, appellant requests that we “reconsider reinstating custody over my two children.” She further asserts that “I do still have the right to fight for custody of my children while they are still in the adoption program.” She states that her appeals to the juvenile courts were rejected on April 28, 2010, and December 9, 2013, but that she was told “that the case is being reviewed in the juvenile court but has now been referred to family court.” She therefore requests reconsideration of the judgment of dissolution, in which issues related to child custody and visitation and child support were “reserved [for] further order of [the] court.” This appeal, however, is not properly before us.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Although appellant is appearing in propria persona, she is still required to follow correct rules of procedure. (*Nwosu v. Uba* (2004) 122 Cal.App.4th 1229, 1246-1247.)

First, appellant has made no showing that the judgment from which she purports to appeal—an uncontested marital dissolution pursuant to Family Code section 2336—is in fact appealable. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.204(a)(2).)<sup>2</sup> Nor is there any information or documentation in appellant’s brief or the record indicating that the trial court has made any order on the reserved child custody and child support matters. (See *ibid.*) Third, appellant provides no relevant, intelligible factual or legal argument. (See rule 8.204(a)(1); see also *Berger v. Godden* (1985) 163 Cal.App.3d 1113, 1119-1120 [dismissing appeal where no issue was “supported by pertinent or cognizable legal argument”].) Finally, appellant seems to be raising issues related to a separate juvenile court matter that is not before us and regarding which we have no information other than a passing comment in a letter from a social worker, attached to her brief, that her parental rights were terminated and her children were adopted some time ago. (See rules 8.204(a)(1) & (a)(2).)

For all of these reasons, the appeal is dismissed.

---

<sup>2</sup> All further rule references are to the California Rules of Court.

---

Kline, P.J.

We concur:

---

Stewart, J.

---

Miller, J.