

STATE OF MICHIGAN  
COURT OF APPEALS

---

KIP GILLEM,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

VITO LATTORE,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED

June 29, 2010

No. 291219

Wayne Circuit Court

LC No. 09-101615-PH

Before: ZAHRA, P.J., and CAVANAGH and FITZGERALD, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondent appeals as of right from the order of the circuit court denying his motion to terminate a personal protection order. We dismiss this appeal as moot. This appeal has 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 PPO in this case expired on February 10, 2010, it is impossible or unnecessary for this Court to fashion any remedy, even if any of respondent’s objections were found to have merit. Because the PPO expired by its own terms, there is nothing for this Court to dissolve, and a remand to the circuit court for a new hearing would serve no purpose.

Further, we conclude that the issues are without public significance, and note that respondent does not assert the existence of any collateral negative consequence of the continued existence of the now-expired PPO. See *Hayford v Hayford*, 279 Mich App 324, 325; 760 NW2d 503 (2008) (concluding that relief could be granted in connection with an expired PPO issued against a gun manufacturer because its continued existence threatened his federal firearms license).

Appeal dismissed.

/s/ Mark J. Cavanagh

/s/ E. Thomas Fitzgerald

**STATE OF MICHIGAN**  
**COURT OF APPEALS**

---

KIP GILLEM,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

VITO LATTORE,

Respondent-Appellant.

---

UNPUBLISHED

June 29, 2010

No. 291219

Wayne Circuit Court

LC No. 09-101615-PH

Before: ZAHRA, P.J., and CAVANAGH and FITZGERALD, JJ.

ZAHRA, P.J. (*concurring*).

Because I have concluded that mere expiration of a PPO does not render moot the question of whether the PPO was properly issued, I concur only in the result of the opinion issued by the majority.

/s/ Brian K. Zahra