

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

In re I.E., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,
Plaintiff and Respondent,
v.
I.E.,
Defendant and Appellant.

A136558

(Contra Costa County
Super. Ct. No. J10-00990)

Minor, I.E., appeals from an order of the juvenile court that committed him to the Youthful Offender Treatment Program (YOTP) following his admission to allegations of a single count of receiving stolen property in violation of Penal Code section 496. His court-appointed counsel has filed a brief seeking our independent review of the record pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, to determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. Based upon our independent review, we affirm.

BACKGROUND

In May 2011, this court reviewed I.E.’s extensive delinquent history and affirmed his previous commitment to YOTP for his violation of probation on charges of felony grand theft and misdemeanor petty theft and false imprisonment. In January 2012, I.E. was released into the aftercare portion of the YOTP and placed on electronic monitoring for 90 days. He was charged with violations of probation in February and early March, and on February 29, I.E. was arrested for burglary by the Oakland police. He was

charged in a reopened petition in Alameda County with burglary and receiving stolen property.

The burglary charge was dismissed when the count of receiving stolen property was found true upon I.E.'s admission. The case was transferred to Contra Costa County for disposition.

The probation officer testified at the disposition hearing and recommended that I.E. be recommitted to YOTP. The court adopted that recommendation, in part, after considering I.E.'s lack of insight into his behavior, his prior institutional history and rejection from alternative placements. I.E. was committed to complete the *Thinking for a Change* portion of the program at the YOTP, and his time of confinement was set by the juvenile court at two years, three months and 21 days.

DISCUSSION

I.E. was properly represented by counsel at all stages of the proceedings, and our review of the record discloses no error. Counsel has represented that he advised I.E. of his intention to file a *Wende* brief in this case and that I.E. has the right to submit a supplemental written argument on his own behalf. He has not done so.

DISPOSITION

The order is affirmed.

Siggins, J.

We concur:

McGuinness, P.J.

Pollak, J.