

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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 JARED M., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

KERN COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN
SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JARED M.,

Defendant and Appellant.

F068811

(Super. Ct. No. JD109112-00)

OPINION

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Kern County. Louie L. Vega,
Judge.

Lauren K. Johnson, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant.

Theresa A. Goldner, County Counsel and Paul E. Blackhurst, Deputy County
Counsel, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

-ooOoo-

Nineteen-year-old Jared M. appeals from the juvenile court's order terminating
dependency jurisdiction over him. Because the juvenile court has since reinstated
jurisdiction over Jared, we dismiss his appeal as moot.

BACKGROUND

Jared became a dependent child of the juvenile court in 2006. After conducting a hearing pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 391, the court terminated its dependency jurisdiction over Jared on January 23, 2014.

Jared appealed from the order terminating dependency jurisdiction, arguing his best interests would be served by maintaining his status as a nonminor dependent, and the Kern County Department of Human Services (department) failed to provide him with information to which he is entitled under section 391 of the Welfare and Institutions Code.

On July 24, the department filed a letter seeking dismissal of the appeal on the ground the juvenile court reinstated dependency jurisdiction over Jared on July 18. On August 1, Jared filed a letter acknowledging the reinstatement of dependency jurisdiction but opposing the department's request to dismiss his appeal.

DISCUSSION

“When no effective relief can be granted, an appeal is moot and will be dismissed.” (*In re Jessica K.* (2000) 79 Cal.App.4th 1313, 1315.) No effective relief can be granted in this case. Any order by this court will have no effect because Jared has already obtained from the juvenile court the relief he properly seeks in this appeal; i.e., reinstatement of the court's dependency jurisdiction. We therefore agree with the department that the appeal is moot and should be dismissed.

In opposing the department's request to dismiss the appeal, Jared complains he was prejudiced by the juvenile court's order terminating dependency jurisdiction because it resulted in him “being deprived of the financial support to which he is entitled from the period between January 23, 2014 and July 18, 2014.” Jared asserts that even though dependency jurisdiction has been reinstated, the juvenile court can provide no remedy for the loss of unspecified “financial support” and “only this Court ... has jurisdiction ... to

remand the matter with an order that Jared’s financial support be paid retroactively.”

Jared cites no authority for this assertion or request for relief.

An appellate court may find that the appeal is not moot “‘if the purported error is of such magnitude as to infect the outcome of [subsequent proceedings] *or* where the alleged defect undermines the juvenile court’s initial jurisdictional finding. Consequently the question of mootness must be decided on a case-by-case basis.’ [Citation.]” (*In re Joshua C.* (1994) 24 Cal.App.4th 1544, 1547.) An appellate court may also “exercise its inherent discretion to resolve an issue rendered moot by subsequent events if the question to be decided is of continuing public importance and is a question capable of repetition, yet evading review.” (*In re Yvonne W.* (2008) 165 Cal.App.4th 1394, 1404.)

None of these scenarios is applicable here. There is no suggestion how the juvenile court’s purported error could prejudice future proceedings or that it raises an important question of public interest that is likely to recur. There is no dispute that the juvenile court’s dependency jurisdiction over Jared has been reinstated. His appeal from the termination of dependency jurisdiction is therefore moot.

DISPOSITION

The appeal is dismissed as moot in light of the juvenile court’s reinstatement of dependency jurisdiction over Jared during the pendency of this appeal.

HILL, P. J.

WE CONCUR:

LEVY, J.

KANE, J.