

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

D.H.,

Defendant and Appellant.

A143482

(San Francisco Super. Ct.  
No. JW146260)

Appellant D.H. appeals from the juvenile court’s October 2014 jurisdictional and dispositional orders. Appellant’s counsel has raised no issue on appeal and asks this court for an independent review of the record to determine whether there are any arguable issues. (*Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Appellant has not filed a supplemental brief. We find no arguable issues and affirm.

BACKGROUND

In September 2014, a Welfare and Institutions Code section 602, subdivision (a) petition was filed by the San Francisco District Attorney, charging appellant, born in September 1997, with second degree robbery (Pen. Code, §§ 211, 212.5, subd. (c)). The

petition alleged appellant took a cellular telephone from the victim, Ya Chan Li; appellant was jointly charged with another minor, C.F.

According to the victim's testimony at the jurisdictional hearing, at approximately 6:30 p.m. on September 15, 2014, she was walking on Miramar Street in San Francisco holding her telephone when three girls approached her. One girl pulled her clothing, another girl pushed her to the ground and grabbed her phone, and the third girl pulled her from behind. The victim called for help and the girl who pushed her then struck her. A car approached and the girls ran away.

Shortly after the robbery, the police took the victim to look at two suspects, and she identified appellant as the person who pulled her clothing. She told the police she recognized appellant's grey shirt, but in her testimony she said she also recognized appellant's face, hairdo, and body build. At the jurisdictional hearing, the victim identified appellant as the girl who pulled her clothing, and identified C.F. as the girl who grabbed her phone and struck her.

Appellant presented testimony from a nearby resident who saw four or five girls running and observed two girls switch sweaters. He did not remember the color of the sweaters or testify appellant was one of the two.

The juvenile sustained the petition and, on October 28, 2014, declared appellant a ward of the court. Appellant was allowed to reside in her mother's home, ordered to comply with conditions of probation, and directed to pay a \$100 fine and a \$10 administrative fee.

#### DISCUSSION

We have reviewed the entire record and have found no arguable appellate issues. Appellate counsel suggests as a possible appellate issue, "Was the evidence sufficient to support a finding beyond a reasonable doubt that appellant was one of the three girls who committed the robbery alleged?" We review the juvenile court's finding that appellant was one of the participants in the robbery for substantial evidence, which

requires us to “ ‘review[ ] the entire record in the light most favorable to the prosecution to determine whether it contains evidence that is reasonable, credible, and of solid value, from which a rational trier of fact could find [the elements of the crime] beyond a reasonable doubt.’ ” (In re George T. (2004) 33 Cal.4th 620, 630–631.) “ ‘We also presume the existence of every fact the lower court could reasonably deduce from the evidence in support of its judgment.’ ” (In re Daniel C. (2011) 195 Cal.App.4th 1350, 1359.)

In the present case, the victim identified appellant as one of the robbers shortly after the incident. There are no apparent circumstances that undermine the credibility of that identification. The resident who testified on appellant’s behalf below did not identify appellant as one of the girls who switched sweaters, and did not testify a grey item of clothing was involved. Thus, that testimony did not undermine the identification. The trial court’s finding is supported by substantial evidence.

The juvenile court’s disposition was not in error.

Appellate counsel advised appellant of her right to file a supplemental brief to bring to this court’s attention any issue she believes deserves review. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106.) Appellant did not file a supplemental brief. There are no legal issues that require further briefing.

#### DISPOSITION

The juvenile court’s orders are affirmed.

---

SIMONS, J.

We concur.

---

JONES, P.J.

---

BRUINIERS, J.