

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

2d Juv. No. B284711
(Super. Ct. No. VJ45503)
(Los Angeles County)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

A.A.,

Defendant and Appellant.

A.A. appeals a judgment entered after the juvenile court sustained one count of a wardship petition alleging that he committed assault by means of force likely to produce great bodily injury. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 602; Pen. Code, § 245, subd. (a)(4).) The court declared A.A. to be a ward of the court, placed him on home probation with terms and conditions, and ordered him to pay a \$100 restitution fine.

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On September 6, 2016, the prosecutor filed a Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 petition alleging that A.A. committed assault by means of force likely to produce great bodily injury (count 1), and personally inflicted great bodily injury upon his victim. (Pen. Code, §§ 245, subd. (a)(4), 12022.7, subd. (a).) On August 21, 2017, the juvenile court held a contested adjudication hearing.

At the hearing, the prosecutor presented evidence that in the evening of June 2, 2016, Muhammad Akhtar was assaulted by A.A. and two other men as Akhtar played basketball in a Cerritos Park. When Akhtar ran from the three men, they followed him and continued to hit and kick him. One of the men then tackled Akhtar and he suffered a fractured right leg that required surgical repair.

Following presentation of evidence and argument by the parties, the juvenile court sustained count 1 of the wardship petition but found the great bodily injury enhancement not true. The court then declared A.A. a ward of the court pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 and ordered him placed on home probation with terms and conditions.

We appointed counsel to represent A.A. in this appeal. After counsel's examination of the record, she filed an opening brief raising no issues.

On November 14, 2017, we advised A.A. that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues that he wished to raise on appeal. We have not received a response.

We have reviewed the entire record and are satisfied that A.A.'s attorney has fully complied with her responsibilities and

that no arguable issue exists. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441; *In re Kevin S.* (2003) 113 Cal.App.4th 97, 119 [prophylactic rules of *Wende* apply to delinquency appeals].)

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

GILBERT, P.J.

We concur:

PERREN, J.

TANGEMAN, J.

Philip K. Mautino, Judge

Superior Court County of Los Angeles

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

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.