

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

BRANT AUSTIN COLEMAN, by his Next
Friend, DONALD S. COLEMAN,

UNPUBLISHED
August 26, 2008

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

KEITH ROBERT YOUNG,

No. 278487
Livingston Circuit Court
LC No. 07-039356-PP

Respondent-Appellant.

Before: Schuette, P.J., and Zahra and Owens, JJ.

MEMORANDUM.

Respondent appeals as of right from the trial court's order denying his motion to terminate a personal protection order (PPO). We dismiss the appeal as moot.

“An issue is moot when an event occurs that makes it impossible for a reviewing court to grant relief. *In re Contempt of Dudzinski*, 257 Mich App 96, 112; 667 NW2d 68 (2003); *B P 7 v Bureau of State Lottery*, 231 Mich App 356, 359; 586 NW2d 117 (1998). Courts generally do not address moot questions or declare principles or rules of law that will have no practical legal effect. *Federated Publications, Inc v Lansing*, 467 Mich 98, 112; 649 NW2d 383 (2002). But a reviewing court may address a moot issue if it is one of public significance that is likely to recur yet evade judicial review. *Id.*, citing *In re Midland Publishing*, 420 Mich 148, 152 n 2; 362 NW2d 580 (1984).

Because the PPO in the case at bar expired on April 24, 2008, it is either impossible or unnecessary for this Court to provide the remedies sought by respondent. That is, because the PPO expired by its own terms, respondent would not be entitled to a separate hearing involving only the PPO issued to petitioner. Nor can we dissolve a PPO that has already expired. Furthermore, the issues are without public significance so we decline to address them.

Appeal dismissed.

/s/ Bill Schuette
/s/ Brian K. Zahra
/s/ Donald S. Owens