

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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 F.F., a Person Coming
Under the Juvenile Court Law.

2d Juv. No. B283690
(Super. Ct. No. FJ52567)
(Los Angeles County)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

F.F.,

Defendant and Appellant.

F.F., a minor, appeals from the juvenile court's May 16, 2017 order denying a motion to dismiss and order finding that a felony second degree robbery petition (Pen. Code, § 211; Welf. & Inst. Code, § 602) was true.¹

¹ All statutory references are to the Penal Code unless otherwise stated.

On December 1, 2016, appellant admitted one count of driving or taking a vehicle without consent on November 8, 2016 (Veh. Code, § 10851, subd. (a)), a second count of driving or taking a vehicle without consent on September 25, 2016, and fleeing a peace officer while driving recklessly (Veh. Code, § 2800.2). The trial court sustained both petitions, declared appellant a ward of the court (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 602), and ordered appellant placed home on probation.

On April 4, 2017, a third petition was filed alleging one count of second degree burglary (§ 211) with a gang enhancement (§ 186.22, subd. (b)(1)(C)) and a firearm use enhancement (§ 12022.53, subds. (b) & (e)(1)). At the adjudication hearing on May 16, 2017, the trial court denied appellant's motion to dismiss the petition, found the felony robbery allegation to be true, sustained the petition, and dismissed the gang and firearm enhancements.² At the May 19, 2017 disposition hearing, the trial court declared appellant a ward of the court, (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 602), found that the maximum period of physical confinement was 16 years four months, and ordered appellant placed in long term camp for seven to nine months.

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.

² The evidence showed that appellant and a male companion robbed Malik Dillard at a 7-Eleven store on March 24, 2017 at 2:10 a.m. Brandishing a firearm, the man took two gold chains and a medallion from Dillard. Appellant joined in the robbery and left with the man. The robbery was photographed on the store video surveillance system.

On November 6, 2017, we advised appellant that he 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.

PERREN, J.

Robert Leventer, Commissioner

Superior Court County of Los Angeles

Marta I. Stanton, under appointment by the Court of
Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Respondent.