

## MEMORANDUM DECISION

Pursuant to Ind. Appellate Rule 65(D), this Memorandum Decision shall not be regarded as precedent or cited before any court except for the purpose of establishing the defense of res judicata, collateral estoppel, or the law of the case.



---

### ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

Toby Gill  
Child Advocates, Inc.  
Indianapolis, Indiana

### ATTORNEY FOR APPELLEE

D.T. (MOTHER)

Victoria L. Bailey  
Marion County  
Public Defender Agency  
Indianapolis, Indiana

### ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLEE INDIANA DEPARTMENT OF CHILD SERVICES

Curtis T. Hill, Jr.  
Attorney General of Indiana

Robert J. Henke  
David E. Corey  
Deputy Attorneys General  
Indianapolis, Indiana

---

## IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA

---

In the Matter of:  
J.T. (Minor Child), Child in  
Need of Services,

and

Child Advocates, Inc.,  
*Appellant-Guardian Ad Litem,*

March 20, 2017

Court of Appeals Case No.  
49A02-1607-JC-1622

Appeal from the Marion Superior  
Court

The Honorable Marilyn A.  
Moores, Judge

---

v.  
D.T. (Mother),  
*Co-Appellee-Respondent*,  
and  
The Indiana Department of  
Child Services,  
*Co-Appellee-Petitioner*

The Honorable Danielle P.  
Gaughan, Magistrate  
Trial Court Cause No.  
49D09-1307-JC-16390  
The Honorable Stephen Eichholtz,  
Judge  
Trial Court Cause No.  
49D08-1601-GU-2310

**Baker, Judge.**

- [1] Child Advocates, Inc., appeals two events that occurred below: (1) the transfer of a guardianship case from probate court to juvenile court; and (2) an order in a Child in Need of Services (CHINS) case changing the child’s permanency plan from adoption to reunification.
- [2] As for the guardianship case, the transfer order is not a final and appealable order. Ind. Appellate Rule 2(H). Moreover, Child Advocates *requested* that the transfer take place; as such, any error was invited. Appellant’s GU App. Vol. II p. 34; Appellant’s CHINS App. Vol. II p. 26. As for the CHINS case, the permanency plan order is not a final and appealable order. *In re D. W.*, 52 N.E.3d 839, 841 (Ind. Ct. App. 2016), *trans. denied*.
- [3] As for both cases, the CHINS case has been closed and the guardianship case has been voluntarily dismissed by Child Advocates. We can offer no effective relief to the parties, and the case is therefore moot. *E.g., DeSalle v. Gentry*, 818

N.E.2d 40, 48-49 (Ind. Ct. App. 2004). For all of these reasons, we hereby dismiss this appeal.

[4] The appeal is dismissed.

Barnes, J., and Crone, J., concur.