

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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 SIX

In re Y.J., a Person Coming  
Under the Juvenile Court Law.

2d Juv. No. B280315  
(Super. Ct. No. 1435731)  
(Santa Barbara County)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

Y.J.,

Defendant and Appellant.

Y.J., a minor, appeals from the juvenile court's January 18, 2017 order for out of home placement and a December 22, 2016 order that the probation department be the lead agency pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 241.1.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> All statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code unless otherwise stated.

On July 1, 2016 a juvenile wardship petition was filed alleging one count of misdemeanor petty theft (Pen. Code, § 484, subd. (a)) and two counts of misdemeanor battery (§ 242). Appellant was released to her parents on house arrest but returned to juvenile hall on July 15, 2016 for violation of electronic monitoring. (Pen. Code, § 1203.016.) The trial court found that appellant was not suitable for informal probation based on appellant's runaway behavior, experimentation with drugs and alcohol, and angry outbursts. (§ 654.)

On August 8, 2016, appellant admitted the petty theft count and one count of battery. The trial court denied informal probation, struck the second battery count with a *Harvey* waiver (*People v. Harvey* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 754), declared appellant a ward of the court (§ 602), and accepted appellant in the Commercially Sexually Exploited Children's (CSEC) Treatment Court. Appellant was released to her mother for 30 days house arrest but later violated probation by absconding.

On September 9, 2016, appellant admitted violating probation and was detained and ordered to undergo a psychological evaluation. On September 26, 2016 the probation violation allegations were dismissed with a *Harvey* waiver and appellant was detained in juvenile hall until October 11, 2016, at which time appellant was released to her mother for home supervision with electronic monitoring. A section 241.1 report was prepared that included a summary of referrals for child abuse, negligence, and sexual abuse. The report discussed appellant's commercial exploitation for sexual services, recommended that the probation department be designated as

the lead agency, and recommended that appellant be continued as a section 602 ward of the court.<sup>2</sup>

On October 17, 2016, appellant violated house arrest by absconding and was taken into custody on October 22, 2016 when she returned home.

On November 4, 2016, a Notice of Violation of Probation (§ 777, subd. (a)) and wardship petition were filed (§ 602, subd. (a)). Appellant was sent home on house arrest with electronic monitoring but absconded again. After appellant was arrested, appellant admitted violating probation and requested that the trial court reconsider the section 241.1 report and make Santa Barbara County Child Welfare Services the lead agency. The trial court denied the request on December 22, 2016.

At a January 18, 2017 contested disposition hearing, the trial court ordered that appellant be placed in the care and custody of the probation department for placement at the Crittendon Group Home in Orange County. On January 20, 2017, the allegations in the December 12, 2016 petition were dismissed with a *Harvey* waiver and appellant was continued a ward of the court. The trial court found that appellant failed to reform on probation, that reasonable efforts were made to avoid

---

<sup>2</sup> Section 241.1, subdivision (a) provides in pertinent part: “Whenever a minor appears to come within the description of both Section 300 and Section 601 or 602, the county probation department and the child welfare services department shall, pursuant to a jointly developed written protocol . . . initially determine which status will serve the best interests of the minor and . . . society. The recommendation of both departments shall be presented . . . and the court shall determine which status is appropriate for the minor.”

appellant's removal from home, and that placement at the Crittendon Group Home was in appellant's best interest.

We appointed counsel to represent appellant in this appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an opening brief in which no issues were raised.

On August 29, 2017, we advised appellant that she had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues which he wished us to consider. No response has been received to date.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that appellant's attorney has fully complied with her responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 443; *In re Kevin S.* (2003) 113 Cal.App.4th 97, 118-119.)

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

YEGAN, J.

We concur:

GILBERT, P. J.

TANGEMAN, J.

Arthur A. Garcia, Judge

Superior Court County of Santa Barbara

---

Laini Millar Melnick, under appointment by the  
Court of Appeal for Defendant and Appellant.  
No appearance for Respondent.