

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

ADRIENNE D.,

Petitioner,

v.

THE SUPERIOR COURT OF MERCED
COUNTY,

Respondent;

MERCED COUNTY HUMAN SERVICES
AGENCY,

Real Party in Interest.

F067706

(Super. Ct. No. JP000833)

OPINION

THE COURT*

ORIGINAL PROCEEDINGS; petition for extraordinary writ review. Brian L. McCabe, Judge.

Adrienne D., in pro. per., for Petitioner.

No appearance for Respondent.

No appearance for Real Party in Interest.

-ooOoo-

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

Adrienne D. (mother) personally seeks an extraordinary writ (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.452) following juvenile court orders denying her reunification services and setting a Welfare and Institutions Code section 366.26 hearing as to her infant son, Nicholas.¹ In her petition, mother states “I Adrienne want all my kids back” and “mistakes on court papers parents are safe and want all 4 kids back.” She also appears to state “the conservatorship judge said yes I have a problem.” Mother does not explain what it is about the juvenile court’s orders that she contests. Because mother’s petition fails to comport with the procedural requirements of California Rules of Court, rule 8.452, we will dismiss it as inadequate.

PROCEDURAL AND FACTUAL HISTORY

Nicholas is the fourth of mother’s children to be removed at birth from her care due to her mental health and substance abuse problems. Psychologists in 2006 concluded mother’s mental health problems, including paranoid schizophrenia, were chronic and rendered her unable to care for a child or utilize reunification services. Consequently, mother’s parental rights were terminated in 2007 to her daughter T.T. Because mother did not make subsequent reasonable efforts to address her mental health and substance abuse issues, she also lost parental rights in 2011 to her daughter L.F., and in 2012 to her daughter Brenda D.

During her pregnancy with Nicholas, mother was declared gravely disabled and unable to care for herself, resulting in the appointment of a conservator for her and placement in a psychiatric facility. She nevertheless believed the conservatorship court would allow her to “keep this one [Nicholas]” and that she would “be getting all three of [her] other children back.” Once again, however, she had failed to make any subsequent reasonable efforts to address her mental health and substance abuse issues.

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

At a July 2013 hearing, the court appointed a guardian ad litem for mother over her objection. The court explained it did so based on the conservatorship adjudication.

The juvenile court thereafter conducted a jurisdictional/dispositional hearing for Nicholas. The court exercised its dependency jurisdiction over Nicholas, removed him from parental custody and denied mother reunification services, based on the prior parental-rights termination orders and mother's failure to subsequently make a reasonable effort to treat her problems (§ 361.5, subd. (b)(11)). The court concluded by setting a section 366.26 hearing to select and implement a permanent plan for Nicholas.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of writ proceedings, such as this, is to facilitate review of a juvenile court's order setting a section 366.26 hearing to select and implement a permanent plan for a dependent child. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.450(a).) A court's decision is presumed correct. (*Denham v. Superior Court* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 557, 564.) It is up to a petitioner to raise specific issues and substantively address them. (§ 366.26, subd. (I).) This court will not independently review the record for possible error. (*In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952, 994.)

In this case, neither mother's court-appointed counsel nor her guardian ad litem petitioned for extraordinary writ review of the juvenile court's order. Rather, it was mother herself who petitioned. While we appreciate mother's desire to have Nicholas, if not her daughters, returned to her, her petition is inadequate. She does not raise any specific issue regarding the juvenile court's orders or otherwise explain why she believes the juvenile court was wrong to make the orders it did.

DISPOSITION

The petition for extraordinary writ is dismissed as inadequate. This opinion is immediately final as to this court.