

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

RICHARD GELONECK,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

MARTIN VAVRA,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

January 27, 2011

No. 295144

Macomb Circuit Court

LC No. 2009-004107-PH

Before: MARKEY, P.J., and ZAHRA and DONOFRIO, JJ.

PER CURIAM.

Respondent appeals as of right from a circuit court order denying his motion to terminate a personal protection order (PPO). We dismiss this appeal as moot. The 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.* Although respondent challenges the trial court’s denial of his request to terminate the PPO, the PPO expired by its terms on September 4, 2010. Even if there is merit to respondent’s contention that the trial court failed to correctly apply and enforce the statutory requirements for issuance of a PPO, because the PPO is now expired, remand for reconsideration of respondent’s motion would serve no purpose. Respondent has not identified any collateral consequences that might arise from the entry of the PPO. See, e.g., *Hayford v Hayford*, 279 Mich App 324, 325; 760 NW2d 503 (2008). Fashioning a remedy for any hardship respondent may have experienced while the PPO was in effect is impossible. Further, this appeal does not present any question of public significance that is likely to recur and yet evade judicial review that would warrant review of the merits of respondent’s argument. See *Detroit v Ambassador Bridge Co*, 481 Mich 29, 50; 748 NW2d 221 (2008). Therefore, we dismiss this appeal as moot.

Appeal dismissed.

/s/ Jane E. Markey

/s/ Pat M. Donofrio

STATE OF MICHIGAN
COURT OF APPEALS

RICHARD GELONECK,

Petitioner-Appellee,

v

MARTIN VAVRA,

Respondent-Appellant.

UNPUBLISHED

January 27, 2011

No. 295144

Macomb Circuit Court

LC No. 2009-004107-PH

Before: MARKEY, P.J., and ZAHRA and DONOFRIO, 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