

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

In re R.F., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

MADERA COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF
SOCIAL SERVICES/CHILD WELFARE
SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

L.H.,

Defendant and Appellant.

F063698

(Super. Ct. No. MJP016680)

OPINION

THE COURT*

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Madera County. Thomas L. Bender, Judge.

Lori A. Fields, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance by respondent.

-ooOoo-

* Before Levy, Acting P.J., Gomes, J., and Kane, J.

L.H. (mother) appeals from a 2011 juvenile court order terminating parental rights (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 366.26) to her one-year-old daughter, R.F. (child).¹ When the child was three months old, she was admitted to a hospital with multiple healing rib fractures and linear bruising on the right abdomen, left leg and left knee. She also had bruising on both sides of her jaw and neck with a rash on her face that appeared to be small hemorrhages and a hemorrhage in her left eye. Mother and the child's father, who were her only caregivers, had no explanation for the child's injuries. However, the child had no history of any skeletal or hematological disorder. The juvenile court found that the father caused the child's bruising and that mother broke the child's ribs. The court exercised its dependency jurisdiction over the child on multiple grounds and later denied mother and the child's father reunification services. The court in turn set a section 366.26 hearing to select and implement a permanent plan for the child. At the section 366.26 hearing, the juvenile court found the child was likely to be adopted and terminated parental rights.

After reviewing the entire record, mother's court-appointed appellate counsel informed this court she could find no arguable issues to raise on mother's behalf. Counsel requested, and this court granted, leave for her to personally file a letter setting forth a good cause showing that an arguable issue of reversible error did exist. (*In re Phoenix H.* (2009) 47 Cal.4th 835, 844.)

Mother has since submitted a letter in which she seeks to relitigate the juvenile court's earlier determination that she and the child's father physically abused the child. However, that determination is no longer subject to our review. (§ 366.26, subd. (l).) An appeal from the most recent order entered in a dependency matter may not challenge prior findings and orders when the court set the section 366.26 hearing. (*In re Anthony B.* (1999) 72 Cal.App.4th 1017, 1022-1023.)

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

Mother's letter otherwise neither addresses the termination proceedings nor sets forth a good cause showing that any arguable issue of reversible error at the termination hearing does exist. (*In re Phoenix H.*, *supra*, 47 Cal.4th at p. 844.)

An appealed-from judgment or order is presumed correct. (*Denham v. Superior Court* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 557, 564.) It is up to an appellant to raise claims of reversible error or other defect and present argument and authority on each point made. If an appellant does not do so, the appeal should be dismissed. (*In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952, 994.) Here, mother does not raise any claim of error or other defect against the termination order from which she appeals.

DISPOSITION

This appeal is dismissed.