Filed 8/28/13 In re Brandon E. CA5

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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 BRANDON E., a Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law.	
FRESNO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES Plaintiff and Respondent, v. BRANDON F., Defendant and Appellant.	F066440 (Super. Ct. No. 12CEJ300190-1) **OPINION**

THE COURT*

APPEAL from orders of the Superior Court of Fresno County. James R. Oppliger, Judge.

Caitlin U. Christian, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, Defendant and Appellant.

Kevin B. Briggs, County Counsel, and William G. Smith, Deputy County Counsel, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

-ooOoo-

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

Brandon F., appellant and presumed father of four-year-old Brandon, appeals from the December 19, 2012, juvenile court dispositional order placing Brandon with him under Welfare and Institutions Code section 361.2,[1] but not terminating its jurisdiction and ordering reunification services for Brandon's mother.[2] Appellant contends the juvenile court's ruling was an abuse of discretion.

By letter dated August 7, 2013, this court informed the parties it proposed: (1) taking judicial notice of the juvenile court's May 22, 2013, order terminating mother's reunification services and June 5, 2013, order terminating dependency; 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.

In light of the juvenile court's order terminating its jurisdiction, it appears the issues appellant raised are 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) 147 Cal.App.3d 952, 958.) Appellant has not asserted, and we perceive, no ground militating against dismissal in the circumstances of this case.

DISPOSITION

The appeal is dismissed.

---

[1] All further statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code unless otherwise indicated.

[2] In August 2012, the Fresno County Department of Social Services removed Brandon from the physical custody of his mother after she was arrested in part for placing heroin and marijuana within reach of then three-year-old Brandon. In October 2012, the juvenile court adjudged Brandon a dependent under section 300, subdivision (b) and ordered appellant (the noncustodial, non-offending parent) unsupervised visitation. In December 2012, the juvenile court ordered Brandon removed from mother's custody and placed in appellant's custody under family maintenance. The juvenile court also ordered reunification services for mother.