## IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----

State of Utah, in the interest of D.J., a person under eighteen years of age.	) MEMORANDUM DECISION ) (Not For Official Publication)
	) Case No. 20091079-CA
B.J. and S.J.,	) FILED ) (February 4, 2010)
Appellants,	) ) 2010 UT App 21
V.	) )
State of Utah,	)
Appellee.	)

\_ \_ \_ \_ \_

Seventh District Juvenile, Price Department, 1017264 The Honorable Mary L. Manley

Attorneys: Travis H. Blackburn, Price, for Appellants Mark L. Shurtleff, Carol L.C. Verdoia, and John M. Peterson, Salt Lake City, for Appellee Martha Pierce, Salt Lake City, Guardian Ad Litem

\_ \_ \_ \_ \_

Before Judges McHugh, Orme, and Bench.<sup>1</sup>

PER CURIAM:

B.J. and S.J. (Parents) appeal the juvenile court's December 16, 2009 order. We dismiss for lack of jurisdiction.

The Utah Rules of Appellate Procedure provide that a party may appeal from final, appealable orders and judgments. <u>See</u> Utah R. App. P. 3(a). In child welfare proceedings, a final, appealable order is one that ends the juvenile court proceedings, leaving no question open for further action by the juvenile court. <u>See In re A.F.</u>, 2006 UT App 200, ¶ 8, 138 P.3d 65. An order that does not completely determine the rights of the parties is an interlocutory order. <u>See id.</u> This court has

1. The Honorable Russell W. Bench, Senior Judge, sat by special assignment pursuant to Utah Code section 78A-3-102 (2008) and rule 11-201(6) of the Utah Rules of Judicial Administration.

previously held that certain types of permanency orders are not final, appealable orders. See <u>id.</u> ¶ 10. Permanency orders that terminate reunification services are interlocutory in nature if further action is contemplated by the juvenile court. See <u>id.</u>

The record indicates that the juvenile court's order terminated reunification services and set this matter for an upcoming review hearing. Because further action is contemplated by the juvenile court, the juvenile court's order is interlocutory in nature. Thus, this court lacks jurisdiction and must dismiss the appeal. See id.  $\P$  8.

Accordingly, this appeal is dismissed without prejudice as to the filing of a timely appeal from a final order.

Carolyn B. McHugh, Associate Presiding Judge

Gregory K. Orme, Judge

Russell W. Bench, Senior Judge