

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

AD,

Petitioner,

v

HAD,

Respondent-Appellant,

and

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN,

Appellee.

UNPUBLISHED
December 22, 2020

No. 350006
St. Clair Circuit Court
Family Division
LC No. 18-002665-PP

Before: SWARTZLE, P.J., and BECKERING and GLEICHER, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Petitioner is respondent’s mother. For purposes of this appeal, it is not necessary to explain why, but suffice it to say that petitioner obtained a personal protection order (PPO) against her daughter. Respondent violated the PPO on multiple occasions, and when sentencing respondent in July 2019, the trial court ordered her to serve 93 days in jail for a previously suspended sentence, and 93 days in jail for the latest violation. Importantly for this appeal, the trial court ordered her to serve the two sentences *consecutive* to each other, rather than *concurrent* to each other.

On appeal, respondent does not challenge her convictions or the lengths of her individual sentences. Rather, respondent challenges only the trial court’s decision to impose the sentences consecutively. And yet, respondent has already served the combined jail time for the two sentences. Even if we were to assume that the trial court erred—a question we do not reach—we cannot undo the time that she has served. Nor has respondent identified any collateral legal consequences that she will suffer due solely to the consecutive nature of the sentences. A decision on the merits by this Court would have no practical effect on the case, and it is well established that this Court will not decide a moot issue. *People v Richmond*, 486 Mich 29, 34; 782 NW2d 187

(2010). While there are exceptions to the mootness doctrine, the issue raised here was not preserved for appellate review, and we decline to apply one of the exceptions.

For these reasons, respondent's appeal is dismissed as moot.

/s/ Brock A. Swartzle
/s/ Jane M. Beckering
/s/ Elizabeth L. Gleicher