

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

VINCENT O.,

Defendant and Appellant.

A140699

(Contra Costa County
Super. Ct. No. J12-00002)

Minor, Vincent O., appeals following his admission to the jurisdiction of the juvenile court and a contested award of restitution. 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 determine there are no such issues and affirm.

BACKGROUND

In June 2012, Vincent admitted to allegations that he possessed marijuana at school in violation of Health & Safety Code section 11357, subdivision (e), received stolen property in violation of Penal Code section 496, subdivision (a), and trespassed upon a dwelling house in violation of Penal Code section 602.5. Issues of restitution were reserved. He was placed on probation with 60 days of home supervision. A supplemental petition was filed in November 2012 alleging that Vincent committed a

burglary in violation of Penal Code sections 459 and 460. In December 2012, Vincent entered a no contest plea to second degree burglary, and his case was transferred to San Francisco County for disposition. Vincent did not appear in San Francisco for his dispositional hearing and a bench warrant was issued for his arrest. He was detained in Contra Costa on the bench warrant in September 2013, and his case was transferred back to Contra Costa County. For the burglary, Vincent was given nine months in juvenile hall to be followed by 90 days of conditional release. A restitution hearing was scheduled.

The burglary victim testified at the restitution hearing to the value of items taken from her home, the cost of her time lost from work due to the proceedings and the costs of repair to her home. The court found her credible and awarded \$3,273 in restitution.

DISCUSSION

There is no reason appearing in the record to question the sufficiency of Vincent's guilty or no contest pleas. The dispositions are within the lawful range. The court properly disallowed the victim's claim for the cost of a home alarm system as an item of restitution because the jurisdictional offense did not authorize it. Vincent was represented by counsel throughout the course of the proceedings. There was no error. His appellate counsel advised Vincent of his intention to file a *Wende* brief, and told Vincent that he has the right to submit a supplemental argument on his own behalf. He has not done so. Vincent was also advised that he may request that his counsel be relieved.

DISPOSITION

The orders are affirmed.

Siggins, J.

We concur:

McGuinness, P.J.

Jenkins, J.