

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

In re J.A., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

2d Juv. No. B267233
(Super. Ct. No. J070291)
(Ventura County)

VENTURA COUNTY HUMAN
SERVICES AGENCY,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

P.A.,

Defendant and Appellant.

P.A. appeals the juvenile court's order terminating parental rights to her minor child J.A. and selecting adoption as the permanent plan (Welf. & Inst. Code,¹ § 366.26.) We appointed counsel to represent appellant on appeal.

On December 18, 2015, counsel filed a brief in which no arguable issues were raised. On February 1, 2016, we notified appellant that she had 30 days within which to submit any contentions that she wished us to consider, and that the appeal would be dismissed in the absence of any arguable issues. (*In re Phoenix H.* (2009) 47 Cal.4th 835, 844-846; *In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952, 994.) Appellant timely responded

¹ All statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code.

with a letter describing her love for J.A., the distress she has suffered due to the termination of her parental rights, and the efforts she has made to address the issues that led to the child's removal. She also offers that J.A.'s siblings, who are in foster care, "ask about" him and "miss him very much."

Although we do not doubt appellant's sincerity, she fails to offer sufficient reasons for us to reverse the court's order. In issuing its ruling, the court found she had failed to meet her burden of proving that a statutory exception to the termination of parental rights applied. Specifically, the court found that neither the beneficial parental relationship exception (§ 366.26, subd. (c)(1)(B)(i)) nor the sibling relationship exception (§ 366.26, subd. (c)(1)(E)) applied because there was no showing that the severance of J.A.'s relationships with this parents and siblings "would be so substantial that it would outweigh the very substantial benefits of having . . . a forever home, a permanent home." Our review of the record discloses that the court's factual findings are supported by substantial evidence and that it properly exercised its discretion in terminating appellant's parental rights and selecting adoption as J.A.'s permanent plan. (See *In re Bailey J.* (2010) 189 Cal.App.4th 1308, 1315-1318 [discussing beneficial parental and sibling relationship exceptions to parental rights termination].)

The judgment (section 366.26 order terminating parental rights) is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

PERREN, J.

We concur:

GILBERT, P. J.

TANGEMAN, J.

Tari L. Cody, Judge
Superior Court County of Ventura

Karen B. Stalter, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant
and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.