

Petitioner additionally alleges that problems related to food, services, and the condition of the facilities at SSCF have exacerbated certain medical symptoms. Because these issues are raised for the first time on appeal, however, we will not address them. In re Whitney, 168 Vt. 209, 214 (1998). Moreover, we note that petitioner submitted a letter after this appeal was filed, indicating that he is no longer being housed at SSCF and is now in the custody of the Department of Mental Health. Accordingly, insofar as petitioner seeks injunctive relief related to his incarceration at SSCF, the issue is moot. See In re P.S., 167 Vt. 63, 68 (1997) (“The general rule is that a case becomes moot when the issues presented are no longer live or the parties lack a legally cognizable interest in the outcome. The actual controversy must be present at all stages of review, not just when the case was filed.” (quotation omitted)).

We have considered all of the arguments discernible in petitioner’s brief and conclude that they are all without merit.*

Affirmed.

BY THE COURT:

Harold E. Eaton, Jr., Associate Justice

Karen R. Carroll, Associate Justice

William D. Cohen, Associate Justice

* On July 10, 2023, prior to oral argument, petitioner filed a series of documents with this Court. The Court has not considered those documents because they were not part of the trial court record.