

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FIVE

In re P.B., a Person Coming Under the  
Juvenile Court Law.

---

LOS ANGELES COUNTY  
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND  
FAMILY SERVICES,

Petitioner,

v.

THE SUPERIOR COURT OF LOS  
ANGELES COUNTY,

Respondent;

TERRI B. et al.,

Real Parties in Interest.

No. B241135

(L.A. Super. Ct. No. CK03561)

ORIGINAL PROCEEDINGS; petition for extraordinary writ. Amy Pellman,  
Judge. Writ is dismissed as moot.

John F. Krattli, Acting County Counsel, James M. Owens, Assistant County Counsel, David Michael Miller, Associate County Counsel, and Tracey Dodds, Principal Deputy County Counsel, for Petitioner.

Law Office of Timothy Martella and Rebecca Harkness, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Real Party in Interest Terri B.

Law Office of Marlene Furth and Danielle Butler Vappie, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Real Party in Interest Clifton G.

Children's Law Center of Los Angeles, Ronnie Cheung and Rebecca Canales for Minor.

No appearance for Respondent.

---

In this petition for extraordinary writ,<sup>1</sup> the Department of Children and Family Services (Department) requests issuance of a peremptory writ of mandate directing the dependency court to vacate its May 10, 2012 order releasing P.B. to Terri B. (mother) pending adjudication and disposition of the Welfare and Institutions Code section 300<sup>2</sup> petition.<sup>3</sup> On May 29, 2012, we issued an alternative writ of mandate ordering the

---

<sup>1</sup> We have taken judicial notice of the minute orders of the proceedings on May 9, 10, June 14, and August 2, 2012, and of the reporter's transcript of the proceedings on May 16, 2012.

<sup>2</sup> Hereinafter, all statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code.

<sup>3</sup> The Department also requested we issue an immediate stay of the May 10, 2012 release order. On May 11, 2012, we granted the stay request and directed the dependency court to re-detain the child pending further order of this court. On May 11, 2012, the dependency court directed the child be detained. On May 16, 2012, the dependency court found under section 319 that the child was at substantial risk of harm in mother's home and continuance in the home was contrary to the child's welfare, and the dependency court ordered temporary care to be vested in the Department pending disposition.

dependency court to vacate its May 10, 2012 release order and issue an order to detain the child under section 319, subdivision (d), or show cause why a peremptory writ ordering the dependency court to do so should not issue.

On August 2, 2012, after sustaining an allegation that P. is a child described by section 300, subdivision (b), the dependency court declared P. a dependent of the court. The court found by clear and convincing evidence that P. was at substantial risk of harm in mother's custody and reasonable efforts were made to eliminate the need for P.' removal from mother's custody. The court removed P. from mother's custody and ordered the Department to provide mother with reunification services.

The Department's request to vacate the dependency court's May 10, 2012 order releasing the child to mother pending adjudication and disposition of the section 300 petition is moot. As the dependency court subsequently issued a dispositional order removing the child from mother's custody, any ruling by this court concerning the May 10, 2012 order will have no practical impact. (See *Carson Citizens for Reform v. Kawagoe* (2009) 178 Cal.App.4th 357, 364 [“A case is moot when any ruling by this court can have no practical impact or provide the parties effectual relief. [Citation.]”]; *In re I.A.* (2011) 201 Cal.App.4th 1484, 1489-1490; *In re Jessica K.* (2000) 79 Cal.App.4th 1313, 1315-1316.)

The petition for extraordinary relief is dismissed as moot.

KRIEGLER, J.

We concur:

TURNER, P. J.

MOSK, J