

NON-PRECEDENTIAL DECISION - SEE SUPERIOR COURT I.O.P. 65.37

IN RE: A.A.J.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF
PENNSYLVANIA

APPEAL OF: M.L.

No. 2466 EDA 2012

Appeal from the Decree and Order of August 20, 2012,
in the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County,
Family Court at Nos. CP-51-AP-0000309-2012
CP-51-DP-0000443-2011

IN RE: R.M.J.

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF
PENNSYLVANIA

APPEAL OF: M.L.

No. 2467 EDA 2012

Appeal from the Decree and Order of August 20, 2012,
in the Court of Common Pleas of Philadelphia County,
Family Court at Nos. CP-51-AP-0000306-2012
CP-51-DP-0000444-2011

BEFORE: OLSON, WECHT and COLVILLE*, JJ.

MEMORANDUM BY COLVILLE, J.:

Filed: March 15, 2013

In these consolidated appeals, M.L. ("Mother") appeals from the decrees involuntarily terminating her parental rights and from the orders changing the goal to adoption with respect to her children, A.A.J., born in December of 2009, and R.M.J., born in August of 2007. We affirm.

* Retired Senior Judge assigned to the Superior Court.

It is well-established that, “[w]hen deficiencies in a brief hinder our ability to conduct a meaningful appellate review, we may dismiss the appeal entirely or find certain issues to be waived.” *Irwin Union National Bank and Trust Co. v. Famous*, 4 A.3d 1099, 1103 (Pa. Super. 2010), citing Pa.R.A.P. 2101. In her brief, Mother failed to include a statement of questions involved as required by Pa.R.A.P. 2111(a)(4) and Pa.R.A.P. 2116(a).¹ *See* Pa.R.A.P. 2116(a) (stating “No question will be considered unless it is stated in the statement of questions involved or is fairly suggested thereby”); *In re K.T.E.L.*, 983 A.2d 745, 750 (Pa. Super. 2009) (finding the mother’s challenges to statutory grounds for terminating her parental rights were waived on appeal because they were not raised in the statement of questions involved). In addition, in her brief, Mother failed to divide her argument “into as many parts as there are questions to be argued,” and she failed to “have at the head of each part – in distinctive type or in type distinctively displayed – the particular point treated therein.” Pa.R.A.P. 2119(a). We conclude the defects in Mother’s brief substantially hinder our ability to conduct a meaningful appellate review. Accordingly, we dismiss Mother’s appeals.

Decrees and orders affirmed.

Judge Olson concurs in the result.

¹ Both Appellee Philadelphia Department of Human Services and the child advocate argue that Mother’s appeals should be dismissed due to her failure to include a statement of questions involved in her brief.