

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

STANISLAUS COUNTY COMMUNITY
SERVICES AGENCY,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

L.H.,

Defendant and Appellant.

F071542

(Super. Ct. No. 516769)

OPINION

THE COURT*

APPEAL from orders of the Superior Court of Stanislaus County. Ann Q.
Ameral, Judge.

Rebekah S. Sass, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

-ooOoo-

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

L.H. (mother) appeals from the juvenile court's order issued at a contested family maintenance and 18-month review hearing (Welf. & Inst. Code, §§ 364, 366.22)¹ (contested hearing) granting father Paul R. primary custody of their 15-year-old daughter, Hannah H., the subject of this appeal.

Mother's court-appointed counsel filed a letter brief pursuant to *In re Phoenix H.* (2009) 47 Cal.4th 835 (*Phoenix H.*), informing this court that she read the entire record and could find no issues to raise on appeal. We granted mother leave to file a letter setting forth a good cause showing that an arguable issue of reversible error does exist.

Mother submitted a letter asking this court to reverse the juvenile court's custody order and grant her full legal and physical custody of her daughter. Mother contends her trial counsel was ineffective.

In 2013, the Stanislaus County Community Services Agency (agency) took then 12-year-old Hannah into protective custody after she and mother got into a physical fight. Law enforcement found Hannah at home alone with a swollen, red cheek. She said mother drank to excess and became threatening and assaultive and she had nowhere to go. At the time, mother had sole legal and physical custody of Hannah. Hannah had not seen her father, Paul, since she was very young and did not have any memory of him. The juvenile court ordered reunification services for mother and Paul. As part of her services plan, mother was evaluated by a psychologist who reported she had a long standing mental disorder (borderline personality disorder with paranoid features) that significantly affected her capacity to care for and control Hannah. In addition, she simply wanted Hannah returned to her custody without taking responsibility for the negative impact her behavior had on her daughter. Until she did, the psychologist did not believe additional services would make a difference and recommended her visitation with

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

Hannah be supervised and their telephone contact limited. In September 2014, the juvenile court ordered Hannah released to Paul's custody under family maintenance services and continued reunification services for mother. In April 2015, following the contested hearing, the juvenile court granted Paul sole physical custody of Hannah, and Paul and mother joint legal custody. The court also granted mother very liberal visitation and ordered her to abstain from alcohol. Mother agreed with the terms of the court's orders, stating, "Just go with what you said. Six months, we'll review it again."

In her 18-page typewritten letter, mother claims her trial counsel was ineffective for failing to introduce evidence that would have rebutted the psychological report. Trial counsel was also ineffective, she claims, for not requesting a more objective social worker, for not arriving on time and prepared for hearings and for injecting his personal prejudice against alcoholics, the mentally ill and the poor.

We have reviewed the record, though we are not required to, and we find no evidence that would warrant further briefing on the issue of whether trial counsel was ineffective. (*Phoenix H.*, *supra*, 47 Cal.4th at pp. 841-842.) Accordingly, we dismiss this appeal.

DISPOSITION

This appeal is dismissed.