

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

In re DANNY O., a Person Coming Under
the Juvenile Court Law.

B251194
(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. VJ40616)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

DANNY O.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,
Kevin Brown, Judge. Affirmed.

Bruce G. Finebaum, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for
Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance by Plaintiff and Respondent.

In December 2010, the People filed a Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 petition against Danny O., then 15 years old, alleging one count of possession for sale of a controlled substance (hydrocodone) (Health & Saf. Code, § 11351), nine counts of misdemeanor vandalism (Pen. Code, § 594, subd. (a)), and one count each of possession of marijuana on school grounds (Health & Saf. Code, § 11357, subd. (e)) and possession of vandalism or graffiti tools (Pen. Code, § 594.2, subd. (a)).

After Danny admitted the felony count of possession of hydrocodone and three counts of misdemeanor vandalism, the juvenile court dismissed the remaining counts, declared Danny a ward of the court, ordered him into suitable placement and calculated the maximum term of confinement as four years.

In November 2012, Danny was seen using marking pens to deface street and parking signs. The People filed a second petition pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 against Danny for three counts of misdemeanor vandalism and one count of possession of vandalism or graffiti tools. The People also filed a Welfare and Institutions Code section 777 petition alleging Danny had violated the probation conditions of his earlier case. Danny denied the allegations of both petitions.

Following the jurisdiction hearing, the juvenile court sustained the petitions. At the disposition hearing, the court ordered Danny to remain a ward of the juvenile court, committed him to a six-month camp placement program, calculated the maximum term of confinement as six years two months and awarded him 44 days of predisposition custody credits.

We appointed counsel to represent Danny on appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an opening brief in which no issues were raised. On February 19, 2014, we advised Danny he had 30 days in which to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. No response has been received to date.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied Danny's attorney has fully complied with the responsibilities of counsel and no arguable issues exist. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 277-284 [120 S.Ct. 746, 145 L.Ed.2d 756]; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 112-113; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

DISPOSITION

The order is affirmed.

WOODS, J.

We concur:

PERLUSS, P.J.

ZELON, J.