## SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK Appellate Division, Fourth Judicial Department

408

CA 08-02443

PRESENT: SCUDDER, P.J., SCONIERS, GREEN, AND GORSKI, JJ.

IN THE MATTER OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, PETITIONER-RESPONDENT,

V

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

CHARLES GRANT, RESPONDENT-APPELLANT, FOR CIVIL MANAGEMENT UNDER ARTICLE 10 OF THE MENTAL HYGIENE LAW.

EMMETT J. CREAHAN, DIRECTOR, MENTAL HYGIENE LEGAL SERVICE, ROCHESTER (KRISTIN DAWSON HENDERSON OF COUNSEL), FOR RESPONDENT-APPELLANT.

ANDREW M. CUOMO, ATTORNEY GENERAL, ALBANY (ROSE MCMORROW OF COUNSEL), FOR PETITIONER-RESPONDENT.

\_\_\_\_\_\_

Appeal from an order of the Supreme Court, Monroe County (Ann Marie Taddeo, J.), entered March 26, 2009 in a proceeding pursuant to Mental Hygiene Law article 10. The order, inter alia, determined that respondent is a sex offender requiring strict and intensive supervision and treatment.

It is hereby ORDERED that said appeal is unanimously dismissed without costs.

Memorandum: Respondent appeals from an order pursuant to Mental Hygiene Law article 10 determining that he is a sex offender requiring strict and intensive supervision and treatment (SIST) and releasing him under the conditions of a prior order imposing a regimen of SIST. Respondent is not aggrieved by the order appealed from inasmuch as he stipulated to the terms of it, and the appeal therefore must be dismissed (see CPLR 5511; Matter of State of New York v Cuevas, 49 AD3d 1324, 1326-1327). In addition, the appeal has been rendered moot by a subsequent order pursuant to Mental Hygiene Law article 10 directing the confinement of respondent as a dangerous sex offender (see generally People ex rel. Maldonado v Williams, 67 AD3d 1328), and the exception to the mootness doctrine does not apply herein (cf. Cuevas, 49 AD3d at 1325-1326; see generally Matter of Hearst Corp. v Clyne, 50 NY2d 707, 714-715).

Entered: March 19, 2010 Patricia L. Morgan Clerk of the Court