

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

In re ISAAC C., a Person Coming Under
the Juvenile Court Law.

B250475
(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. MJ18452)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ISAAC C.,

Defendant and Appellant.

THE COURT:*

A petition filed under Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 alleged that appellant Isaac C. committed vandalism and damage by graffiti in violation of Penal Code section 594, subdivision (a). Following a contested adjudication hearing, the juvenile court sustained the petition, declared that appellant remain a ward of the court, and found the offense to be a felony. The court ordered appellant to remain home on

*

BOREN, P. J., ASHMANN-GERST, J., FERNS, J.†

† Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.

probation under the same conditions that had previously been imposed. This appeal followed.

We appointed counsel to represent appellant on this appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an “Opening Brief” in which no arguable issues were raised. On December 20, 2013, we advised appellant that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues that he wished us to consider. No response has been submitted to date.

We have examined the record and conclude that it provides a factual basis to support the juvenile court’s order sustaining the petition. The record shows that on July 10, 2012, Los Angeles County Deputy Sheriff Lauren Brown, who was assigned as the graffiti investigator for the City of Palmdale, received appellant’s name from an informant as being a possible participant in the “WDC” tagging crew. From photographs on the city’s “graffiti tracker” program, Deputy Brown saw that the WDC crew was active. He also located appellant’s profile and photographs on Facebook, along with postings of “WDC.” Police records showed that appellant was on probation for vandalism.

On July 10, 2012, Deputy Brown and other officers searched the trailer where appellant lived with his family. During a search of appellant’s bedroom, as permitted by the terms of his probation, Deputy Brown found a letter dated May 9, 2012, that stated, “WDC or don’t write at all.” Appellant’s family was briefly detained during the search.

Appellant was handcuffed and taken to the police station. Once at the station, his handcuffs were removed and he was seated at a desk in a cubicle in the squad room. Deputy Brown read appellant his rights under *Miranda v. Arizona* (1966) 384 U.S. 436. After appellant initialed, signed and dated the admonition and waiver of rights form, Deputy Brown questioned him. Appellant said that his moniker was “so what.” Deputy Brown printed photographs from the graffiti tracker program and asked appellant to circle and initial the graffiti he had created. Appellant identified 23 photographs, and wrote an apology letter.

Officer Ruth Oschmann, a crime prevention officer in Palmdale, testified that the cost of cleaning up graffiti was \$408 per incident, and the total cost of cleaning up 23 incidents of graffiti would amount to \$9,384. At the disposition hearing, the juvenile court referred the matter of restitution to the probation department.

Appellant testified that he had never sprayed graffiti on anything, and he only identified the photographs because Deputy Brown told him he would go to jail if he did not do so. He wrote the apology letter only because Deputy Brown said it would make him look good in court. He denied having a Facebook account and denied that the photographs on the Facebook page were pictures of him.

We 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.)

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS.