

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

In re F.P., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

F.P.,

Defendant and Appellant.

A135713

(Alameda County
Super. Ct. No. SJ12185401)

Defendant F.P. appeals from the juvenile court's dispositional order adjudging him to be a ward of the court. His appointed counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*), in which he raises no issue for appeal and asks this court for an independent review of the record. (See also *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106 (*Kelly*)). Counsel has represented that defendant has been informed of his right to file a supplemental brief. We have received no such brief.

Having reviewed the entire record in accordance with *Wende* and *Kelly*, we agree with counsel that no arguable issue exists on appeal. Accordingly, we affirm the juvenile court's order.

FACTUAL HISTORY AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Because defendant has appealed only the dispositional order, and not the jurisdictional order, details of the evidence for and against him are not relevant to this appeal and we therefore provide only a summary.

On the evening of December 28, 2011, a family came home to discover a burglary in progress. A person wearing black clothing jumped out of a window and some of the family members ran after him. The mother of the family entered the home and discovered a young male in her bedroom. He was wearing a black hooded sweatshirt and a black Raiders cap, with the bill facing backwards. She asked him what he was doing in her room, and he said, "I am the policeman." At trial, she identified the male as defendant. There was another person in the room, but she only saw his back. This second person jumped out of the window and defendant followed. Less than 30 minutes later, the police drove her to another location where she identified defendant.

On March 8, 2012, a petition was filed pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 602, subdivision (a), alleging defendant had committed a single felony count of first degree residential burglary (Pen. Code, § 459).

On March 22, 2012, defendant was placed on electronic monitoring.

On April 19, 2012, the juvenile court ordered defendant remanded to juvenile hall, finding him in violation of the electronic monitoring order.

The jurisdictional hearing was held on May 21, 2012. The juvenile court found defendant had committed a violation of Penal Code section 459 in the first degree, describing the identification of him as "awfully strong."

The dispositional hearing was held on June 5, 2012. The juvenile court ordered defendant released to his older sister, and required him to be on electronic monitoring for 120 days. He was given permission to visit his parents in Mexico during the summer, with resumption of electronic monitoring upon his return. He was ordered to pay a restitution fine of \$100. He was also ordered to comply with standard probation conditions, obey his sister, attend classes or a job, and maintain a curfew of no later than 8:00 p.m. absent prior permission.

DISCUSSION

A juvenile court's dispositional order may be reversed on appeal only upon a showing the court abused its discretion. " " "We must indulge all reasonable inferences to support the decision of the juvenile court and will not disturb its findings when there is

substantial evidence to support them.” ’ [Citation.]” (*In re Robert H.* (2002) 96 Cal.App.4th 1317, 1330.)

Defendant was represented by counsel and received fair jurisdictional and dispositional hearings. Substantial evidence supports the juvenile court’s finding of first degree burglary. The court correctly set the maximum term of confinement at six years. Moreover, the court acted within its discretion in imposing electronic monitoring and certain conditions of probation on him. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 730, subd. (b).) Having ensured defendant received adequate and effective appellate review, we thus affirm the court’s dispositional order.

DISPOSITION

The dispositional order is affirmed.

Dondero, J.

We concur:

Marchiano, P. J.

Margulies, J.