

# MEMORANDUM DECISION

Pursuant to Ind. Appellate Rule 65(D), this Memorandum Decision is not binding precedent for any court and may be cited only for persuasive value or to establish res judicata, collateral estoppel, or law of the case.



---

## ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

Bethanni E. Forbush-Moss  
Law Offices of Forbush-Moss PSC  
Louisville, Kentucky

---

# IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF INDIANA

---

Chanse Lamar Oliver,  
*Appellant-Respondent,*

v.

L.M.H.,  
*Appellee-Petitioner*

January 31, 2024

Court of Appeals Case No.  
23A-PO-1853

Appeal from the Clark Circuit  
Court

The Honorable William A.  
Dawkins, Jr., Magistrate

Trial Court Cause No.  
10C04-2306-PO-324

**Memorandum Decision by Judge Crone**  
Judges Bailey and Pyle concur.

**Crone, Judge.**

[1] Chanse Lamar Oliver (Father) appeals the trial court’s issuance of a six-month protective order against him in favor of L.M.H. (Mother), arguing that there is insufficient evidence to support the issuance of the order. We note that Mother did not file an appellate brief, and therefore we will not undertake the burden of developing arguments for her. *Mullett v. Baker*, 120 N.E.3d 630, 632 (Ind. Ct. App. 2019). Instead, our standard of review is less stringent, and we will reverse only upon a showing of “prima facie error, which is error at first sight, on first appearance, or on the face of it.” *Id.* Nevertheless, to determine whether reversal is required, we are still obligated to correctly apply the law to the facts in the record. *Id.*

[2] That said, we need not address Father’s argument because this case is moot. “A case becomes moot when it is no longer live and the parties lack a legally cognizable interest in the outcome or when no effective relief can be rendered.” *Liddle v. Clark*, 107 N.E.3d 478, 481 (Ind. Ct. App. 2018) (citation omitted), *trans. denied*. Specifically, a request for injunctive relief is moot when no relief is possible or if the relief sought has already occurred. *See, e.g., Medley v. Lemmon*, 994 N.E.2d 1177, 1183 (Ind. Ct. App. 2013) (request for injunctive relief regarding visitation restrictions became moot when those restrictions expired), *trans. denied*. The sixth-month protective order issued here expired on January

10, 2024. Accordingly, this case is no longer live, and there is no effective relief to be granted. Consequently, we dismiss Father's appeal as moot.<sup>1</sup>

[3] Dismissed.

Bailey, J., and Pyle, J., concur.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mootness notwithstanding, we observe that Father failed to make cogent argument to support his claim for relief and therefore has waived appellate review of the sufficiency of the evidence. *See* Ind. Appellate Rule 46(A)(8)(a) (noting that each contention in appellant's brief must be supported by cogent reasoning and citations to the record); *Schwartz v. Schwartz*, 773 N.E.2d 348, 353 n.5 (Ind. Ct. App. 2002) (failure to make cogent argument as required by Rule 46(A)(8)(a) results in waiver of issue on appeal).