

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

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

MERCED COUNTY HUMAN SERVICES  
AGENCY,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

A.T.,

Appellant.

F062406

(Super. Ct. No. JP000212B)

**OPINION**

**THE COURT\***

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Merced County. John D.  
Kiriwara, Judge.

Thomas M. Pfeiff for Appellant.

James N. Fincher, County Counsel, and James B. Tarhalla, Deputy County  
Counsel, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

---

\* Before Levy, Acting P.J., Gomes, J. and Dawson, J.

-ooOoo-

A.T., a juvenile court dependent, appeals from the May 3, 2011 juvenile court order which granted the Welfare and Institutions Code section 388<sup>1</sup> petition of A.T.'s father, J.G., and provided him with reunification services.<sup>2</sup> In briefing filed with this court, A.T.'s sole contention is that the juvenile court abused its discretion when it found that it was in A.T.'s best interest to provide J.G. with reunification services.

By letter dated February 7, 2012, this court informed the parties it proposed (1) taking judicial notice of the juvenile court's December 7, 2011 minute orders terminating dependency and juvenile court jurisdiction over A.T. and awarding custody to J.G., and (2) dismissing this appeal as moot. The letter invited the parties to file supplemental briefing on the propriety of our taking these actions and advised them that if we did not receive a response, we would dismiss the appeal as moot. We received no response.

As the December 7, 2011 minute order shows the juvenile court has dismissed dependency over A.T., it appears the issue A.T. raised is moot in that this court cannot render any effectual relief. (See *Eye Dog Foundation v. State Board of Guide Dogs for the Blind* (1967) 67 Cal.2d 536, 541; *City of Los Angeles v. County of Los Angeles* (1983)

---

<sup>1</sup> Subsequent statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code.

<sup>2</sup> In May 2010, the juvenile court adjudged then nearly two-month-old A.T. a dependent under section 300, subdivisions (b) and (g), removed him from his mother's custody and gave her reunification services. The court did not offer reunification services to J.G., whose whereabouts were unknown, because he was an alleged father. In December 2010, the juvenile court terminated mother's reunification services and set a permanency planning hearing pursuant to section 366.26. In January 2011, the Merced County Human Services Agency located J.G. through an absent parent search. After paternity testing confirmed J.G. as A.T.'s biological father, J.G. filed a section 388 petition requesting reunification services, which the juvenile court granted following a contested hearing.

147 Cal.App.3d 952, 958.) A.T. has not asserted, and we perceive, no ground militating against dismissal in the circumstances of this case.

**DISPOSITION**

The appeal is dismissed.