

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

NICOLE GORDON,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

THOMAS JAMES,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED
December 1, 2009

No. 287207
Oakland Circuit Court
LC No. 2008-746537-PH

GARY GORDON,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

THOMAS JAMES,

Respondent-Appellant.

No. 287208
Oakland Circuit Court
LC No. 2008-746538-PH

Before: Talbot, P.J., and O'Connell and Davis, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Petitioners were granted personal protection orders (PPOs) against respondent at an initial hearing. Respondent filed a motion to terminate the orders, which was denied after a subsequent hearing. Respondent appeals as of right. We dismiss the appeals as moot. These appeals have been decided without oral argument pursuant to MCR 7.214(E).

“As a general rule, an appellate court will not decide moot issues.” *B P 7 v Bureau of State Lottery*, 231 Mich App 356, 359; 586 NW2d 117 (1998). “An issue is deemed moot when an event occurs that renders it impossible for a reviewing court to grant relief.” *Id.*

Because the PPOs in this case expired on May 22, 2009, we are unable to fashion a remedy for respondent even if his challenges are found to have merit.¹ There is nothing for this Court to dissolve, given that the PPOs have already expired by their own terms.

Respondent's only issues on appeal are that the trial court erred in finding that petitioners met their burdens of proof in obtaining the PPOs and that the court violated his due process rights when it issued and continued the PPOs. Those issues lack public significance. Further, respondent has not alleged that he will suffer any collateral negative consequence as a result of the continued existence of the now-expired PPOs so as to compel us to review the merits of his issues despite their mootness.² See *Hayford v Hayford*, 279 Mich App 324, 325; 760 NW2d 503 (2008) (holding that the challenge to a PPO was not moot because the existence of the expired PPO could potentially jeopardize the gun manufacturer's federal firearms license).

Appeals dismissed.

/s/ Michael J. Talbot
/s/ Peter D. O'Connell
/s/ Alton T. Davis

¹ Were we to rule on the merits of this case, we would affirm the trial court's decision.

² Although respondent mentions in his reply brief that his "substantial rights were affected in that he now has a personal protection order entered against him which is recorded in the LIEN system and he was required to surrender his concealed weapons permit," he does not indicate whether these encumbrances would continue after the expiration of the PPOs or otherwise explain how the existence of an expired PPO against him would harm him in any way. This Court has no duty to investigate and discover any hindrance that respondent might face due to the existence of an expired PPO. See *Mitcham v Detroit*, 355 Mich 182, 203; 94 NW2d 388 (1959).