

IN THE UTAH COURT OF APPEALS

-----ooOoo-----

Tamara Rowley Mulder,)	MEMORANDUM DECISION	
)	(Not For Official Publication)	
Petitioner and Appellee,)		
)	Case No. 20070919-CA	
v.)		
)	F I L E D	
Robert Matthew Mulder,)	(February 22, 2008)	
)		
Respondent and Appellant.)	<table border="1"><tr><td>2008 UT App 52</td></tr></table>	2008 UT App 52
2008 UT App 52			

Fourth District, Provo Department, 054401811
The Honorable James R. Taylor

Attorneys: Robert M. Mulder, Clearlake Oaks, California,
Appellant Pro Se
Stephen T. Hard, Murray, for Appellee

Before Judges Thorne, Bench, and Billings.

PER CURIAM:

Robert Mulder appeals the district court's order finding him guilty of civil contempt.¹ This case is before the court on a sua sponte motion for summary disposition for insubstantial question. Robert Mulder did not respond to the motion.

Robert Mulder asserts that the district court erred in ordering him to serve fifteen days in jail for civil contempt. Tamara Mulder asserts that in addition to presenting an insubstantial question, the issue is moot. We agree.

A case is deemed moot when the requested judicial relief cannot remedy the issues raised by the litigants. See Jones v. Schwendiman, 721 P.2d 893, 894 (Utah 1986). We refrain from adjudicating issues when they are moot. See id. This court can provide no judicial relief that will reverse Robert Mulder's time spent incarcerated. Thus, we find the issue to be moot.

1. Robert Mulder also appeals a "supplemental order," which is substantively a scheduling order and is not a final appealable order.

Furthermore, the underlying contempt order has been affirmed in a prior decision.²

Accordingly, Robert Mulder's appeal is dismissed.

William A. Thorne Jr.,
Associate Presiding Judge

Russell W. Bench, Judge

Judith M. Billings, Judge

2. To the extent that Robert Mulder's docketing statement could be construed as presenting other arguments, this court has determined such issues to be without merit.