Filed 6/20/19 Beauchamp v. Beauchamp 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NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

MICHAEL LAWRENCE BEAUCHAMP, Plaintiff and Appellant, v. RICHARD L. BEAUCHAMP, Defendant and Respondent.	A152873 (City & County of San Francisco Super. Ct. No. FM-17-387005)

Appellant Michael Lawrence Beauchamp, appearing in propria persona, purports to appeal from the denial of a petition he apparently has filed in the San Francisco Superior Court to obtain a new birth certificate. His appellate brief fails to comply with numerous provisions of the California Rules of Court and is largely unintelligible. The clerk's record is missing many critical documents, including the very petition he filed in the trial court, and he has elected to proceed without a reporter's transcript. Although far from clear, it appears that appellant may have been born in another state and seeks to disown his parents who he claims have abused him. In all events, the clerk's transcript does contain his notice of appeal, which indicates he is appealing from an order removing his petition from the calendar without prejudice, and the court's order, also included, confirms that is what the trial court has done.[1] Such an order is not an appealable order. (Code Civ. Proc., § 904.1.) The appeal therefore must be and is hereby dismissed.[2]

[1] The order reads in full: "This matter is taken off-calendar. To the extent that Petitioner's August 11, 2017 filing is a Request for Order, the request is denied without prejudice. The pleading filed by Petitioner on August 11, 2017 does not state a legally recognizable

POLLAK, P. J.

WE CONCUR:

STREETER, J.
TUCHER, J.

---

request and does not provide sufficient notice to anyone as to what Petitioner is requesting or the reasons therefore. Finally, Petitioner's filing of August 11, 2017 also does not provide this Court with sufficient information from which to determine whether or not the State of California has any jurisdiction. This issue arises on the face of the subject filing given the attachments of orders and legal proceedings out of the states of New Jersey and Wisconsin. The Court will prepare the Findings and Orders After Hearing." No such findings and order is included in the record.

[2] Appellant's unopposed motion to prevent discrimination is denied.