

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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 K.B. et al., Persons Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

MERCED COUNTY HUMAN SERVICES
AGENCY,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

R.G.,

Defendant and Appellant.

F069619

(Super. Ct. Nos. JP000660, JP000860)

OPINION

THE COURT*

APPEAL from orders of the Superior Court of Merced County. Brian L. McCabe,
Judge.

Darlene Azevedo Kelly, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant
and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

-ooOoo-

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

R.G. (mother) has two sons, two-year-old K.B. and one-year-old A.B. (the children). Mother appealed from a May 7, 2014 order terminating her parental rights (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 366.26)¹ as to the children. After reviewing the juvenile court record, mother's court-appointed counsel informed this court she could find no arguable issues to raise on mother's behalf. This court granted mother leave to personally file a letter setting forth a good cause showing that an arguable issue of reversible error exists. (*In re Phoenix H.* (2009) 47 Cal.4th 835, 844 (*Phoenix H.*).

Mother submitted a letter in which she objects to the termination of her parental rights and expressed her desire that the children remain in the care of their paternal grandparents until she is stable and finishes her psychological treatment. She informs this court that she has been in therapy since January 2014 and is taking her medication. She has a job as a sales associate, lives with her mother and is attending college.

We conclude mother failed to address the termination proceedings or set forth a good cause showing that any arguable issue of reversible error arose from the termination hearing. (*Phoenix H., supra*, 47 Cal.4th at p. 844.) Consequently, we dismiss the appeal.

PROCEDURAL AND FACTUAL SUMMARY

Dependency proceedings were initiated in August 2012 when the Merced County Human Services Agency (agency) took then two-month-old K.B. into protective custody because mother's home was dirty, she had untreated depression and was cutting herself, and she left K.B. alone in the home on multiple occasions.

In March 2013, following a contested dispositional hearing, the juvenile court denied mother reunification services under section 361.5, subdivision (b)(2) after two psychologists concluded she had a mental disorder that prevented her from benefitting

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

from reunification services. One of the psychologists reported that mother engaged in risky behavior that endangered K.B. and needed immediate intervention to address her serious mental health issues.

The juvenile court ordered reunification services for K.B.'s father and set the six-month review hearing for September 2013. K.B. was placed with his paternal grandparents.

In July 2013, mother gave birth to A.B. The agency took him into protective custody because of mother's untreated mental illness. The juvenile court released A.B. to mother's custody on the condition that she and A.B. live with the maternal aunt and comply with a safety plan. The juvenile court ordered A.B. placed with mother under family maintenance services.

In October 2013, the agency removed A.B. from mother and filed a supplemental petition (§ 387) after mother left then four-month-old A.B. alone. Mother admitted leaving A.B. alone twice but claimed it was for no more than five minutes each time.

In January 2014, the juvenile court denied mother reunification services as to A.B. because of her mental disorder (§ 361.5, subd. (b)(2)) and terminated reunification services for K.B.'s father. The court set a section 366.26 hearing for both children. Mother challenged the juvenile court's setting order by writ petition which we denied (*R.G. v. Superior Court* (April 7, 2014, F068746 [nonpub. opn.]).

The agency recommended the juvenile court terminate mother's parental rights as to both children and order adoption with their paternal grandparents as their permanent plan. Mother visited the children weekly and A.B. was receptive to her but K.B. was not. He would not look at mother and on occasion would cry when he saw her. Mother had difficulty managing both children together and was not capable of safely parenting K.B.

Mother told the social worker she did not object to the paternal grandparents having temporary custody of the children but did not want her parental rights terminated. She wanted to resume custody of them after she completed her psychotherapy and school.

Mother appeared with her attorney at the section 366.26 hearing in May 2014. Her attorney submitted the matter and mother made a statement to the court reiterating what she told the social worker. Mother stated:

“I do agree that my kids could stay with the grandparents, but I don’t want my parental rights terminated. [What] I want is for them to have temporary custody and guardianship until I am done with my psychotherapy, [am emotionally stable] and [am] ready to have my kids back. Because I am doing everything that I am supposed to be doing. I’m still seeking out services.”

The juvenile court terminated mother’s parental rights and selected adoption as the permanent plan. This appeal ensued.

DISCUSSION

An appealed-from judgment or order is presumed correct. (*Denham v. Superior Court* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 557, 564.) It is appellant’s burden to raise claims of reversible error or other defect and present argument and authority on each point made. If appellant fails to do so, the appeal may be dismissed. (*In re Sade C.* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 952, 994.)

At a termination hearing, the juvenile court’s focus is on whether it is likely the child will be adopted and if so, order termination of parental rights. (*In re Marilyn H.* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 295, 309.) If, as in this case, the children are likely to be adopted, the juvenile court must terminate parental rights unless the parent proves there is a compelling reason for finding that termination would be detrimental to the child under any of the circumstances listed in section 366.26, subdivision (c)(1)(B) (exceptions to adoption).

In this case, mother did not argue at the section 366.26 hearing that any of the exceptions to adoption applied and she does not raise any other objection to the juvenile court's termination order in her appeal. Consequently, we dismiss the appeal.

DISPOSITION

This appeal is dismissed.