

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

FRESNO COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF
SOCIAL SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

CHRISTI E.,

Defendant and Appellant.

F070924

(Super. Ct. No. 04CEJ300019-2)

OPINION

THE COURT*

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Fresno County. Mary Dolas,
Judge.

S. Lynne Klein, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant.

Daniel C. Cederborg, County Counsel, and David F. Rodriguez, Deputy County
Counsel, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

-ooOoo-

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

Christi E., mother of Christopher F., appeals from the juvenile court's findings and orders made at the February 2, 2015, contested six-month review hearing held pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 366.21, subdivision (e), in which the juvenile court found that Christopher's parents were provided reasonable reunification services and ordered continuation of their services.¹ In briefing filed with this court, Christi's sole contention is that substantial evidence does not support the juvenile court's finding that she was provided reasonable reunification services.

By letter dated October 20, 2015, this court informed the parties it proposed (1) taking judicial notice of the juvenile court's July 27, 2015, orders terminating dependency and juvenile court jurisdiction over Christopher and awarding custody to Christopher's father, Lawrence, 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.

As the July 27, 2015 minute order shows the juvenile court has dismissed dependency jurisdiction over Christopher, and Christi has not appealed that order, it appears the issue Christi raised in this appeal is 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.) Christi has not asserted, and we perceive, no ground militating against dismissal in the circumstances of this case.

DISPOSITION

The appeal is dismissed.

¹ In July 2014, the juvenile court adjudged 11-year-old Christopher a dependent under Welfare and Institutions Code section 300, subdivisions (b) and (j), removed him from the custody of Christi and Christopher's father, Lawrence F., and gave the parents reunification services.