

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

In the Matter of TIA JACKSON, Minor.

---

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

TIA JACKSON,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED

September 25, 2012

No. 304435

Wayne Circuit Court

Family Division

LC No. 10-494710

Before: MURPHY, C.J., and MARKEY and WHITBECK, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondent appeals by right the trial court's order placing her with the Michigan Department of Human Services for care and supervision. Respondent admitted to violating her probation which was imposed for incorrigible behavior and resisting police. We affirm.

Respondent did not comply with the terms of probation when she was suspended from school twice, had 13 disciplinary referrals at school and received failing grades. Respondent also did not obey the reasonable commands of her parents.

Respondent argues the trial court abused its discretion when it placed her with the Michigan Department of Human Services instead of with her grandmother. We disagree.

This issue is moot because respondent is no longer placed with the Michigan Department of Human Services and is currently living with her mother. In general, appellate courts will not decide moot issues. See *People v Richmond*, 486 Mich 29, 34; 782 NW2d 187 (2010). An issue is moot when deciding it will have no practical legal effect in the case. *Id.* at 34-35. Here, because respondent is no longer placed outside the community, a judgment on this matter would not have any practical legal effect. Therefore, this issue is moot.

In any event, the trial court did not abuse its broad discretion vested to enter orders of disposition regarding juvenile delinquents within its jurisdiction. See MCL 712A.18; *In re Ricks*, 167 Mich App 285, 295; 421 NW2d 667 (1988); *In re Scruggs*, 134 Mich App 617, 621-622; 350 NW2d 916 (1984). An abuse of discretion occurs when the trial court's decision is

outside the range of principled outcomes. *People v Babcock*, 469 Mich 247, 269; 666 NW2d 231 (2003).

Once the trial court acquires jurisdiction over a juvenile, it must hold a dispositional hearing to determine what measures to take. MCR 3.943(A). Upon finding that a juvenile is guilty of an offense, the trial court has the discretion to enter any order of disposition that is appropriate for the welfare of the juvenile and society. MCL 712A.18; MCR 3.943(E). A court may commit a juvenile to the Michigan Department of Human Services for placement provided such disposition is “appropriate for the welfare of the juvenile and society in view of the facts proven and ascertained.” MCL 712A.18. Additionally, the trial court must articulate reasons for its disposition of the case. *In re Chapel*, 134 Mich App 308, 315; 350 NW2d 871 (1984).

The trial court’s order of disposition was within the principled range of outcomes as described in MCL 712A.18. The record indicates that respondent’s placement with the Michigan Department of Human Services was appropriate for the welfare of respondent and society. The trial court placed respondent with the Michigan Department of Human Services based on respondent’s behavior, not because of the parent’s behavior. The trial court specifically addressed respondent’s behavior directly by stating she was not behaving in school, was suspended from school twice and had opportunities to change her behavior but failed to do so. Ultimately, the trial court articulated reasons for its disposition and was not required, as respondent claims, to enumerate the reasons why it decided not to place respondent with her grandmother.

We affirm.

/s/ William B. Murphy  
/s/ Jane E. Markey  
/s/ William C. Whitbeck