

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FIVE

In re LESLIE D., a Person Coming Under
the Juvenile Court Law.

B247718
(Los Angeles County Super. Ct.
No. VJ39313)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

LESLIE D.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Fumiko
Wasserman, Judge. Affirmed.

Gerald Peters, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Appellant Leslie D. appeals from the order of the juvenile court sustaining petitions under Welfare and Institutions Code sections 602 and 777,¹ and the dispositional order entered after the petitions were sustained. This court appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. On June 19, 2013, appointed counsel filed a brief raising no issues, asking this court to independently review the record for arguable appellate contentions under *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436. Appellant was advised of her right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days. No supplemental brief has been received.

We have completed our independent review of the record, which shows appellant was the subject of two prior sustained petitions under section 602. This appeal follows a contested hearing on a third section 602 petition, which was combined with a probation violation under section 777. The juvenile court found appellant committed misdemeanor battery (Pen. Code § 242) and violated probation by slapping her mother. In doing so, the court expressly resolved credibility issues in favor of mother's testimony over that of appellant, who claimed her mother fabricated the incident in order to have appellant removed from the home.

The juvenile court's factual findings are supported by substantial evidence. The dispositional order of suitable placement, and the various terms and conditions of probation, are clear and reasonably related to appellant's current and prior cases.

We are satisfied there are no arguable contentions on appeal. The judgment is affirmed. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259.)

KRIEGLER, J.

We concur:

TURNER, P. J.

MOSK, J.

¹ All statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code, unless otherwise indicated.