

Filed 1/13/17 In re M.D. CA2/1

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

B275487

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. TJ21059)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

M.D.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Arthur M. Lew, Judge. Affirmed.

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

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

On January 15, 2016, the People filed a Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 petition alleging M.D., then 15 years old, had committed first degree burglary in violation of Penal Code section 459.

At the jurisdiction hearing, Charlie Manns testified he was alerted by his home security system that someone had tampered with a bedroom window. Returning home, Manns discovered the security bars had been pried off the window and \$100 in coins and a watch from his dresser were missing. M.D., who lived next door, had never been invited to Manns' home and did not have his permission to be inside the home.

The police recovered latent fingerprints from inside and outside Manns' bedroom window sill. The Automated Fingerprint Identification System¹ operated by the police returned a match for the latent prints and M.D.'s fingerprints. In court, a police fingerprint specialist compared M.D.'s fingerprints with those from the crime scene and concluded they matched.

M.D. admitted to the police that he had been inside the home while Manns was away, but denied taking anything.²

M.D. did not testify or introduce other evidence in his defense.

¹ The Automated Fingerprint Identification System is a computer system that compares unknown fingerprints with fingerprints from known individuals and suggests possible matches for further evaluation.

² Prior to the interview, the police advised M.D. 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].)

At the conclusion of the hearing the juvenile court found the allegation true, declared the offense a felony and sustained the petition. The court ordered M.D. to remain a ward of the court and placed him home on probation.³

We appointed counsel to represent M.D. on appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an opening brief in which no issues were raised. On October 11, 2016, we advised M.D. 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 M.D.'s appellate 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, 118-119; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441-442.)

³ M.D. had previously been declared a ward of the juvenile court in 2015 under Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 following the filing of an amended delinquency petition for trespass. The court sustained the petition and ordered M.D. home on probation.

DISPOSITION

The order is affirmed.

KEENY, J.*

We concur:

ZELON, Acting P. J.

SEGAL, J.

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