

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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 D.O., A Person Coming Under the  
Juvenile Court Law.

SONOMA COUNTY HUMAN SERVICES  
DEPARTMENT,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

D.O.,

Defendant and Appellant.

A146544

(Sonoma County  
Super. Ct. No. 4491DEP)

On December 21, 2015, Mother’s appointed appellate counsel filed a no issues statement in accordance with *In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952, stating that counsel had thoroughly reviewed the record and had not found any arguable issues to raise on appeal.

Mother was then advised by the clerk of this court, by letter dated January 29, 2016, that she could “file a letter stating issues you feel should be reviewed on appeal,” and that if she did not do so within 30 days, her appeal would be dismissed. The clerk’s letter also advised appellant that if she did file a letter, it would “be forwarded to the Court for determination as to whether your attorney should be directed to brief any or all issues outlined in your letter,” and that if the Court decided “to direct your attorney to

provide further briefing, a letter will issue from this Court,” but if not, the appeal would be dismissed.

We have reviewed a document received on March 1, 2016, from appellant herself, and have determined that none of the issues she seeks to raise meet the standards for further consideration by counsel or by this court. It appears that appellant’s complaints on appeal stem from her belief that the dependency court judge was disqualified from hearing her case because he had earlier involvement in several criminal cases where her former husband, Robert O., was the defendant. However, there are no citations to the record where these facts can be verified, where objections were raised concerning this allegation, nor does appellant explain how that asserted involvement gave rise to a disqualifying event in the dependency case as to her.<sup>1</sup>

She also complains generally that “false statements and facts were given by the opposing party.” However, once again, her assertion lacks specificity and any citations to the record where such statements appear.

For all of these reasons, we conclude that none of the issues appellant seeks to raise meet the standards for further consideration by counsel or by this court. The appeal is therefore dismissed. (*In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952, 994.)

---

<sup>1</sup> Her former husband is not a party to this appeal.

---

RUVOLO, P. J.

We concur:

---

REARDON, J.

---

STREETER, J.

A146544, *In re D.O.*