

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

In re S.A., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

S.A.,

Defendant and Appellant.

A135635

(Contra Costa County
Super. Ct. No. J1101314)

In October 2011, 17-year-old S.A. was made a ward of the Contra Costa Juvenile Court after he conceded a misdemeanor allegation of receiving stolen property. S.A. was placed in his parents' custody, given community service, and a strict curfew.

On December 30, 2011, S.A. was one of two youths who robbed a patron in the parking lot of a Berkeley restaurant. In March 2012, when S.A. was now past his 18th birthday, he admitted to the Alameda Juvenile Court that he participated in the robbery, whereupon the matter was transferred to Contra Costa—the county of S.A.'s residence—for disposition.

At the dispositional hearing held in April 2012, the probation officer recommended that S.A. be continued as a ward and committed to a county institution for a period not to exceed four years and 353 days. After listening to S.A.'s counsel and his father argue for a more lenient disposition, the Contra Costa Juvenile Court adopted the probation officer's recommendation.

S.A.'s appointed counsel has filed a brief in which she advises that she finds no arguable issues to present, and, pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, requests that this court conduct an independent review of the record to determine if there are any arguable issues that require briefing. S.A. was informed of his right to file a supplemental brief, but he elected not to do so.

Our independent review discloses that S.A. was at all times ably represented by independent counsel. S.A. was almost 18 years of age at the time of the latest offense, and his admission to the Alameda petition obviated the need for any further action at the jurisdictional hearing. That admission was preceded by the appropriate admonitions and advisement of rights. The juvenile court took account of all appropriate factors in reaching the placement disposition. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 725.5; *In re James R.* (2007) 153 Cal.App.4th 413, 432.) We have identified no issues that require briefing.

The order is affirmed.

Richman, J.

We concur:

Kline, P.J.

Haerle, J.