

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

**In re D.C., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.**

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

D.C.,

Defendant and Appellant.

A136140

**(San Francisco County
Super. Ct. No. JW08-6153)**

D.C. appeals from an order continuing him as a ward of the juvenile court and placing him outside his mother's home. (Welf. & Inst. Code, §§ 602.) His court-appointed counsel has filed an opening brief raising no issues and seeking our independent review of the record pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*) and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 (*Anders*), a procedure that is applicable to juvenile delinquency proceedings (*In re Kevin S.* (2003) 113 Cal.App.4th 97, 99). We find no arguable issues and affirm.

I. BACKGROUND

Appellant has been in the juvenile justice system since he was 13 years old. Born to a teenage mother who has had difficulties controlling him, he has had juvenile adjudications for felony grand theft (Pen. Code, § 487, subd. (c)), uttering offensive words (Pen. Code, § 415, subd. (3)), battery (Pen. Code, § 242), misdemeanor receiving stolen property (Pen. Code, § 496, subd. (a)), and misdemeanor assault by means likely to cause great bodily injury (§ 245, subd. (a)(1)). Since his initial contact with the juvenile court, he has alternated between out-of-home placements and his mother's home.

On May 31, 2012, when appellant was 16 years old, the district attorney filed the most recent wardship petition alleging that appellant committed a second degree robbery. (Pen. Code, §§ 211, 212.5, subd. (c).) A contested jurisdictional hearing was held, at which the following evidence was presented:

On the evening of May 30, 2012, Carol R. was standing near the intersection of Powell and Ellis streets in San Francisco when appellant yanked her purse off her shoulder with sufficient force to turn her around and drag her to the ground. As he ran away with the purse, appellant was knocked to the ground by a bystander. A second bystander, Graham D., tackled appellant after he attempted to flee and held him by the legs. Appellant said he didn't want the purse anymore. Police officers arrived within a few minutes and took custody of appellant. The victim identified appellant at the scene, though she could not do so at the jurisdictional hearing. Graham D., identified appellant at the hearing.

The trial court sustained the wardship petition and ordered appellant committed to the probation department for out-of-home placement. A multidisciplinary team report recommended that appellant be placed in the Woodward Academy in Iowa for approximately 18 months. Appellant and his mother agreed to this recommendation and the court approved the placement.

II. DISCUSSION

As required by *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 124, we affirmatively note that appointed counsel has filed a *Wende/Anders* brief raising no issues, that defendant

has been advised of his right to file a supplemental brief, and that he has not filed such a brief. We have independently reviewed the entire record for potential error and find none.

Substantial evidence supports the juvenile court's determination that appellant committed a second degree robbery. (See *In re Ryan N.* (2001) 92 Cal.App.4th 1359, 1371-1372.) The out-of-home placement order was also supported by substantial evidence and was not an abuse of discretion. (See *In re Robert H.* (2002) 96 Cal.App.4th 1317, 1329-1330.) On appellant's application, the juvenile court has corrected the number of days credited to appellant for time served.

We are satisfied that appellant's appointed attorney has fully complied with the responsibilities of appellate counsel and that no arguable issues exist. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 283.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NEEDHAM, J.

We concur.

JONES, P. J.

BRUINIERS, J.