

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

In re J.O., a Person Coming Under the  
Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

J.O.,

Defendant and Appellant.

A142918

(Marin County  
Super. Ct. Nos. JV25844B &  
JV25844G)

**I.**

**INTRODUCTION**

Appellant J.O. (appellant) appeals from restitution orders issued in Petitions B and E relating to the above-identified juvenile delinquency matters. Appellant’s counsel has filed an opening brief in which no issues are raised and asks this court for an independent review of the record as required by *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436. Counsel has declared that appellant has been notified that no issues were being raised by counsel on appeal and that an independent review under *Wende* instead was being requested. Appellant was also advised of his right personally to file a supplemental brief raising any issues he chooses to bring to this court’s attention. No supplemental brief has been filed by appellant personally.

**II.**  
**BACKGROUND**

On September 23, 2013, the Marin County District Attorney filed a supplemental Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 petition (Petition B) alleging that appellant violated Penal Code section 459 (commercial burglary). J.O. admitted the allegation on November 6, 2013, at which time the juvenile court adjudged him a ward of the court, ordered behavioral therapy, imposed a restitution fine of \$486.00, and imposed other standard conditions of probation. No objection was raised either to the restitution fine, or to the terms of probation.

On April 23, 2014, the district attorney filed another supplemental petition (Petition E) this time alleging that on March 27, 2014, appellant violated Penal Code section 594, subdivision (b)(2)(A) (vandalism). J.O. admitted the vandalism allegation on August 5, 2014. During the dispositional hearing on August 19, 2014, the juvenile court ordered that J.O. remain in juvenile hall for 20 days, complete 100 hours of community service, undergo psychological evaluation and cognitive therapy through the SENECA program, pay victim restitution of \$147.00, and comply with standard conditions of probation. The amount of restitution ordered with regard to Petition E was subsequently reduced to \$73.50.<sup>1</sup>

**III.**  
**SUMMARY DISCUSSION**

We have reviewed the entire record as it relates to appellant's challenge to the restitution orders, including the transcript of the hearings relative to the setting of restitution. We conclude that the two challenged orders imposing restitution were supported by the evidence, and were consistent with applicable law. Appellant was

---

<sup>1</sup> A contested restitution hearing was held on January 22, 2015, at which time a number of restitution fines were reviewed (Petitions E and H). The minute order of that hearing was the subject of a request to take judicial notice filed by appellant on March 5, 2015, and granted on March 25.

represented by counsel throughout the proceedings, and we have concluded there are no meritorious issues to be argued, or that require further briefing on appeal.

**IV.**  
**DISPOSITION**

The judgment is affirmed.

\_\_\_\_\_  
RUVOLO, P. J.

We concur:

\_\_\_\_\_  
REARDON, J.

\_\_\_\_\_  
STREETER, J.