

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
TWELFTH APPELLATE DISTRICT OF OHIO
WARREN COUNTY

IN RE:	:	CASE NO. CA2025-12-124
A.M.D., et al.	:	
	:	<u>OPINION AND</u>
	:	<u>JUDGMENT ENTRY</u>
	:	8/17/2026
	:	
	:	
	:	

APPEAL FROM WARREN COUNTY COURT OF COMMON PLEAS
JUVENILE DIVISION
Case Nos. 23-D000066, 23-D000067, 23-D000068, 23-D000069

David P. Fornshell, Warren County Prosecuting Attorney, and Kirsten A. Brandt, Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, for appellee.

Mother, pro se.

OPINION

PIPER, P.J.

{¶ 1} Appellant, Mother, appeals the decision of the Warren County Court of Common Pleas, Juvenile Division, modifying the temporary custody and residential

placement of her minor children with Maternal Grandmother. For the reasons set forth below, we dismiss Mother's appeal as moot.

I. Factual and Procedural Background

{¶ 2} Appellant is the mother of A.M.D., A.S., and A.H., and legal custodian of E.W. In May 2023, Warren County Children Services ("WCCS") filed a complaint in the Warren County Juvenile Court alleging that A.M.D. was an abused and dependent child and that the other children were dependent children. The juvenile court subsequently adjudicated A.M.D. abused and dependent, and A.S., A.H., and E.W. dependent, and ordered temporary custody to Maternal Grandmother with protective supervision to WCCS. The juvenile court extended temporary custody through 2024 and 2025 while Mother, acting pro se, filed a series of motions, objections, appeals, and original actions.

{¶ 3} On October 3, 2025, in response to a report that A.S. had been physically abused by Maternal Grandmother, WCCS filed a motion for emergency custody and requested a shelter care hearing, which Mother opposed. The juvenile court magistrate held a hearing the same day and modified the prior dispositional order granting temporary custody to Maternal Grandmother, removed the children from Maternal Grandmother's care, and placed the children in the temporary custody of WCCS. On October 6, 2025, Maternal Grandmother filed a motion for a rehearing due to an alleged lack of notice and to stay enforcement of the modified order. Mother and Maternal Grandmother also objected to the magistrate's decision, requested findings of fact and conclusions of law, and moved for kinship placement. The magistrate held an expedited hearing that same day and issued findings of fact and conclusions of law. On October 8, 2025, the magistrate ordered that the October 3, 2025 decision would continue in full force and effect.

{¶ 4} On December 5, 2025, the juvenile court judge denied Mother's October 6, 2025 objections and adopted the magistrate's decision. Mother filed supplemental

objections and, on December 16, 2025, the judge denied the same and again adopted the magistrate's decision.

{¶ 5} Following the juvenile court's removal of the children from Maternal Grandmother's care, A.M.D. was placed with her biological father. A.M.D.'s case was closed by consent on December 12, 2025. The juvenile court and WCCS investigated and attempted different placements for A.S., A.H., and E.W., but each failed for different reasons. On December 19, 2025, the juvenile court returned A.S., A.H., and E.W. to Maternal Grandmother's custody.

{¶ 6} Nevertheless, on December 22, 2025, Mother appealed the juvenile court's December 5 and 16, 2025 decisions. She now raises seven assignments of error for our review.

II. Legal Analysis

{¶ 7} On appeal, Mother challenges the juvenile court's December 5 and 16, 2025 decisions adopting the magistrate's October 3, 2025 decision which modified temporary custody of the children and removed them from Maternal Grandmother's care. Mother's seven assignments of error raise various procedural issues and dispute the findings of the juvenile court in issuing that modified temporary custody order. However, prior to Mother filing this appeal, A.M.D.'s case was closed by consent, and A.S., A.H., and E.W., were returned to Maternal Grandmother's custody. As a result, the modified temporary custody order that Mother challenges is no longer in effect and therefore her appeal is moot. *In re A.G.*, 2014-Ohio-2597, ¶ 37 (courts will not decide cases in which there is no longer any actual controversy); *O'Conner v. Stires*, 2017-Ohio-8929, ¶ 12 (12th Dist.) (potential error in granting temporary custody had no bearing on the ultimate outcome of the case where temporary custody order was superseded by a subsequent custody order). Moreover, we find no exception to the mootness doctrine applies here, as this

case does not present an issue capable of repetition yet evading review, nor does it involve a matter of public or great general interest.¹ *In re M.B.*, 2021-Ohio-2716, ¶ 24 (12th Dist.); *In re A.G.* at ¶ 37.

III. Conclusion

{¶ 8} The modified temporary custody order Mother appeals is no longer in effect, therefore Mother's appeal is moot.

{¶ 9} Appeal dismissed.

M. POWELL and SIEBERT, JJ., concur.

1. We note that after this appeal was filed, the juvenile court granted legal custody of A.S., A.H., and E.W. to Maternal Grandmother on March 12, 2026, and WCCS closed its case as to all of the children.

JUDGMENT ENTRY

The assignments of error properly before this court having been found to be moot, it is the order of this court that the judgment or final order appealed from be, and the same hereby is, dismissed.

It is further ordered that a mandate be sent to the Warren County Court of Common Pleas, Juvenile Division, for execution upon this judgment and that a certified copy of this Opinion and Judgment Entry shall constitute the mandate pursuant to App.R. 27.

Costs to be taxed in compliance with App.R. 24.

/s/ Robin N. Piper, Presiding Judge

/s/ Mike Powell, Judge

/s/ Melena S. Siebert, Judge