

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

A144068

Plaintiff and Respondent,

**(Contra Costa County
Super. Ct. No. J1400484)**

v.

J.L.,

Defendant and Appellant.

_____ /

The juvenile court adjudged J.L. (minor) a ward of the court (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 602),¹ removed him from parental custody, and committed him to Orin Allen Youth Rehabilitation Facility (the Ranch) for six months, with an additional conditional release period and standard probation conditions. The minor appeals. His appointed counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*). Having reviewed the record, we affirm.

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

In May 2014, the 16-year-old minor and a friend assaulted a man at a Concord liquor store and took his bottle of alcohol. In the operative section 602 wardship petition,

¹ Unless noted, all further statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code.

the People alleged the minor committed felony second degree robbery (Pen. Code, § 212.5, subd. (c)), felony assault by force likely to produce great bodily injury (Pen. Code, § 245, subd. (a)(4)), felony grand theft (Pen. Code, § 487, subd. (c)) and misdemeanor battery (Pen. Code, § 243). The minor pled no contest to felony grand theft (Pen. Code, § 487, subd. (c)) and misdemeanor battery (Pen. Code, § 243).

The probation department recommended adjudging the minor a ward of the court, removing him from parental custody, and committing him to the Ranch for six months, with an additional “conditional release/parole period.” According to the probation report, the minor lacked maturity and control over his emotions, and had a “serious substance abuse problem[,]” and numerous unexcused school absences and suspensions. The probation report also noted the “lack of parental control in the home[.]” According to the probation department, the minor was “at high risk to re-offend” and would benefit from supervision at the Ranch. The minor agreed with the probation department’s recommendations. At the dispositional hearing, the court adjudged the minor a ward of the court, removed him from parental custody, and committed him to the Ranch for six months, “plus 90 days of conditional release.”

The minor appealed, and we appointed counsel to represent him. Appointed counsel filed a *Wende* brief and informed the minor he had the right to file a supplemental brief on his own behalf. The minor declined to do so.

DISCUSSION

We have reviewed the entire record pursuant to *Wende* and find no arguable issues on appeal. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106.) The court made the required findings when the minor entered his plea. (*In re Matthew N.* (2013) 216 Cal.App.4th 1412, 1420; Cal. Rules of Court, rule 5.778(e), (f).) The court did not abuse its discretion by removing the minor from parental custody and placing him at the Ranch. (*In re Robert H.* (2002) 96 Cal.App.4th 1317, 1331; *In re Sergio R.* (2003) 106 Cal.App.4th 597, 608.) There is no sentencing error. (*People v. Kwizera* (2000) 78 Cal.App.4th 1238, 1240; see also § 730, subd. (a).) The minor has been adequately represented by counsel at every stage of the proceedings.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

Jones, P.J.

We concur:

Simons, J.

Bruiniers, J.