

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

SIXTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

In re M.C. et al., a Person Coming Under
the Juvenile Court Law.

H041868
(Santa Cruz County
Super. Ct. No. DP002700, DP002701)

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY HUMAN
RESOURCES AGENCY,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

C.M.,

Defendant and Appellant.

C.M. (mother), the mother of M.C. and N.C.-M. (the children), purports to appeal from orders made on January 6, 2015 under the Welfare and Institutions Code section 388¹ in the children’s dependency cases. (See § 388 [petition for modification]; Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.570.) We will dismiss this appeal.

On December 16, 2014, mother filed a “Request to Change Court Order” (Judicial Council form JV-180) in both dependency cases (hereafter section 388 petition). She asked the court to vacate the “Selection and Implementation Hearing” (see § 366.26) and “order family reunification services to [her]” in the children’s dependency cases. Mother’s reasons for those requests were her beliefs that “it is in her children’s best interest she . . . continue to be their mother” and “their bond has grown stronger and their ‘little family of three’ should not be broken.”

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

On January 6, 2015, the juvenile court denied the section 388 petitions without a hearing. It found that mother failed to make a prima facie showing of changed circumstances and granting a hearing would not be in the best interest of the children.

On January 21, 2015, mother filed notices of appeal from the January 6, 2015 orders denying her section 388 petitions.

Although mother filed unitary appellate briefs ostensibly applicable to both this appeal and her pending appeal from the court's orders following the section 366.26 hearing (*In re M.C. et al.; Santa Cruz County HSD v. C.M.* (Sept. 27, 2015, H041999) [nonpub. opn.]²), the briefs contain no arguments concerning the January 6, 2015 orders denying mother's section 388 petitions. Neither does she seek any relief from this court concerning those orders in her briefs.

“ ‘A “reviewing court has inherent power, on motion or its own motion, to dismiss an appeal which it cannot or should not hear and determine.” (9 Witkin, Cal. Procedure (3d ed. 1985) Appeal, § 508, p. 494.) An appealed-from judgment or order is presumed correct. (E.g., *Denham v. Superior Court* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 557, 564.) Hence, the appellant must make a challenge. In so doing, [s]he must raise claims of reversible error or other defect (see *ibid.*), and “present argument and authority on each point made” [Citations.] If [s]he does not, [s]he may, in the court's discretion, be deemed to have abandoned [her] appeal. (*Berger v. Godden* [(1985)] 163 Cal.App.3d [1113,] 1119.) In that event, it may order dismissal. (*Ibid.*) . . . ’ [Citation.]” (*Conservatorship of Ben C.* (2007) 40 Cal.4th 529, 544, fn. 8.)

We construe mother's briefs as an abandonment of this appeal. (See Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.411.) Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal on our own motion.

DISPOSITION

The appeal is dismissed.

² This court denied mother's motion to consolidate the appeals. On our own motion, we ordered the appeals to be considered together for the purposes of briefing, oral argument and decision.

ELIA, J.

WE CONCUR:

RUSHING, P. J.

WALSH, J.*

In re M.C. et al.; Santa Cruz County HSD v. C.M.
H041868

*Judge of the Santa Clara County Superior Court assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.