

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

a Person Coming Under the Juvenile  
Court Law.

B240375

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. KJ36821)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ROBERTO R.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Merrill L. Toole, Temporary Judge. (Pursuant to Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21.) Affirmed.

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

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

---

## INTRODUCTION

Appellant Roberto R. appeals from the juvenile court's order declaring him a ward of the court and directing him into camp community placement after finding he committed first degree burglary. No meritorious issues have been identified following a review of the record by appellant's appointed counsel and our own independent review of the record. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.) We affirm.

## FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

In November 2011, police took then 16-year-old appellant into custody for burglarizing two residences. On November 25, 2011, the People filed a Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 petition against appellant, alleging two counts of first degree burglary. (Pen. Code, § 459.)

At the jurisdiction hearing on February 14, 2012, the juvenile court granted the People's motion to dismiss one count of first degree burglary (count 1) in the interests of justice. During the hearing, Debra Whitfield testified she came home to find appellant, whom she had never met, inside her residence. Whitfield screamed for him to leave, and he fled with her laptop computer. Whitfield later identified appellant as the burglar in a field show-up. Appellant was arrested and advised of his right to remain silent, to the presence of an attorney and, if indigent, to appointed counsel (*Miranda v. Arizona* (1966) 384 U.S. 436 [86 S.Ct. 1602, 16 L.Ed.2d 694]), which he waived. Appellant then told police that he and some friends were breaking into houses and stealing whatever they liked.

At the conclusion of the jurisdiction hearing, the juvenile court found true the allegation that appellant committed first degree burglary and sustained the petition as to that count. At the disposition hearing the following day, the court found the offense to be a felony, declared appellant a ward of the court and ordered him into a six-month camp

community placement program. The court calculated the maximum term of confinement as six years.

### **DISCUSSION**

We appointed counsel to represent appellant on appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an opening brief in which no issues were raised. On August 6, 2012, we advised appellant that he had 30 days within 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 appellant's attorney has complied fully with the responsibilities of counsel. 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, 118-119; *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 441.)

### **DISPOSITION**

The order is affirmed.

JACKSON, J.

We concur:

WOODS, Acting P. J.

ZELON, J.