

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

In re RICHARD H., a Person Coming
Under the Juvenile Court Law.

B256228
(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. VJ43819)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

RICHARD H.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Kevin Brown, Judge. Affirmed.

Adrian K. Panton, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

On September 10, 2013, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Deputy Jesus Hernandez and his partner Deputy Sheriff Jesse Figueroa were conducting an investigation on Rosemead Boulevard near Angel's Motel in Pico Rivera when they witnessed appellant Richard H. walking parallel to them on the far sidewalk. They saw appellant stop next to Angel's Motel, owned by Harry Patel, and write something on its front wall with a black pen. Hernandez and Figueroa crossed the street, detained him, and read him his *Miranda* rights (*Miranda v. Arizona* (1966) 384 U.S. 436). Appellant indicated he understood his rights and told the deputies he was a member of the "Sexual Money Molesters Krew" tagging crew. He admitted to writing "SMMK" on the wall using a black pen Hernandez found in his backpack.

The trial court found appellant to be described under section 602 of the Welfare and Institutions Code in that he had committed vandalism (Pen. Code, § 594, subd. (a)) and was in possession of tools to commit vandalism (Pen. Code, § 594.2, subd. (a)). His motion to dismiss under Welfare and Institutions Code section 701.1 was denied. The offenses were declared to be misdemeanors and appellant was placed on home probation. The court awarded him one day of predisposition credit. He timely appealed.

We appointed counsel to represent appellant on appeal, and after examination of the record appointed counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues and asking this court to independently review the record. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441-442.) On November 3, 2014, we sent letters to appellant and appointed counsel, directing counsel to immediately forward the appellate record to appellant and advising him that within 30 days he could personally submit any contentions or issues that he wished us to consider. Appellant did not respond.

We have examined the entire record and find no arguable issue exists. We are therefore satisfied that appellant's attorney complied with his responsibilities and affirm the judgment. (*People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 441.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

CHANEY, J.

We concur:

ROTHSCHILD, P. J.

JOHNSON, J.