

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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 V.V. et al., Persons Coming Under
Juvenile Court Law.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND
FAMILY SERVICES,

Petitioner and Respondent,

v.

S.R.,

Objector and Appellant.

B269952

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. CK91916)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Amy M. Pellman, Judge. Reversed with directions.

Roni Keller, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Objector and Appellant.

Mary C. Wickham, County Counsel, R. Keith Davis, Assistant County Counsel and Kim Nemoy, Principal Deputy County Counsel for Petitioner and Respondent.

Charles Aghoian for the Minors.

S.R., the mother of the six children, appeals from a January 21, 2016 parental termination rights order. The mother contends the January 21, 2016 parental termination rights order must be reversed because of noncompliance with the Indian Child Welfare Act and related California provisions. The parties, including the children's counsel, have stipulated to a limited reversal of the parental termination rights order to allow compliance with the Indian Child Welfare Act and related California provisions. In addition, the parties have stipulated to immediate remittitur issuance. The cause having been presented to us, we accept the parties' stipulation.

The parties agree there was noncompliance with the Indian Child Welfare Act and related California provisions. We concur in their assessment in this regard. Further, the parties agree the parental termination rights order must be reversed and remanded to permit proof of compliance with the Indian Child Welfare Act and related California provisions. Our ability to accept a stipulated reversal in the dependency context is discussed in the case of *In re Rashad H.* (2000) 78 Cal.App.4th 376, 379-382. The present case involves reversible error—the failure to present substantial evidence of compliance with the Indian Child Welfare Act and its related California provisions. (*In re Marinna J.* (2001) 90 Cal.App.4th 731, 736-740; *In re Desiree F.* (2000) 83 Cal.App.4th 460, 471-472.) Under any circumstances, the parental termination rights order would be reversed. Thus, a stipulated reversal advances those interests identified in Code of Civil Procedure section 128, subdivision (a)(8). (*In re Rashad H.*, *supra*, 78 Cal.App.4th at pp. 379-382; see *Union Bank of California v. Braille Inst. of America, Inc.* (2001) 92 Cal.App.4th 1324, 1329-1330.) If proper notice and investigation is undertaken and no tribe asserts that a child is of Indian descent, the parental termination rights order is to be reinstated. If a tribe asserts that a child is of Indian descent, the juvenile court is to proceed in compliance with the Indian Child Welfare Act and related California provisions.

Obviously, if not all children are of Indian descent, the juvenile court can decide how to proceed. For example, if proper investigation reveals that only one child is of Indian descent, then the juvenile court may proceed to enter parental termination rights

orders as to the other youngsters. The timing of when to enter a parental termination rights order if not all children are of Indian descent is a matter we leave in the juvenile court's good hands.

The parental termination rights order is reversed and the cause is remanded for compliance with the federal Indian Child Welfare Act requirements and related state provisions. The remittitur is to issue forthwith.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

TURNER, P. J.

We concur:

KRIEGLER, J.

BAKER, J.