

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

A145472

v.

**(Alameda County
Super. Ct. No. SJ140227569)**

JUAN R.,

Defendant and Appellant.

_____ /

The juvenile court adjudged Juan R. (the minor) a continued ward of the court (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 602)¹ and committed him to Camp Sweeney (juvenile facility). The minor appeals. His appointed counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*). We have reviewed the record pursuant to *Wende* and find no reasonably arguable appellate issue. We affirm.

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

In November 2014, the 15-year-old minor admitted misdemeanor maliciously and willfully disturbing another person by loud and unreasonable noise (Pen. Code, § 415,

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

subd. (2)). The court adjudicated the minor a ward of the court (§ 602) and placed him on formal probation, subject to various terms and conditions.²

In March 2015, law enforcement officers found the minor and other young men near a loaded shotgun and a loaded semi-automatic handgun. The officers arrested the minor; he admitted he and his friend shot the guns in the Oakland Hills and photographed themselves with the guns. The People filed a supplemental section 602 petition alleging felony violations of Penal Code section 25850, subdivision (a), carrying a loaded firearm in public. The minor admitted a misdemeanor violation of Penal Code section 25850, subdivision (a). The court found a factual basis for the admission and continued the minor as a ward of the court (§ 602).

The probation department recommended placing the minor — then 17 years old — at Camp Sweeney. The probation report noted the minor: (1) had not complied with the terms and conditions of probation because he “consistently tested positive for marijuana and failed to improve his overall behavior[;]” (2) was habitually truant and was failing all of his classes; and (3) had been suspended from school and referred to a disciplinary hearing for “defying authority, harassment, causing/threatening harm, and willfully using force or violence.” The minor’s counsel urged the court to place the minor on probation in his mother’s home with “enhanced services” from the Family Preservation Unit; according to counsel, the minor realized he needed to “change the direction of his life” and was “capable of turning his life around in the home of his family.”

Following a contested dispositional hearing, the court continued the minor as a ward of the court (§ 602) and placed him at Camp Sweeney. It determined the minor had “been tried on probation in the custody of [his] parent and failed to reform. Reasonable efforts were made to prevent or eliminate the need for removal. Remaining in the home is contrary to [the minor’s] welfare.”

² The minor appealed. We modified certain probation conditions but otherwise affirmed. (*In re Juan R.* (Sept. 3, 2015, A142715) [nonpub. opn.])

DISCUSSION

We have reviewed the record and find no arguable issues. The minor was ably represented by counsel and had a full and fair opportunity to present his case to the juvenile court at the dispositional hearing. The court did not abuse its discretion in committing the minor to Camp Sweeney. (*In re Angela M.* (2003) 111 Cal.App.4th 1392, 1396 [reviewing juvenile court’s commitment decision for abuse of discretion, with all reasonable inferences indulged to support its decision]; *In re Asean D.* (1993) 14 Cal.App.4th 467, 473 [even “commitment to the Youth Authority may be made in the first instance, without previous resort to less restrictive placements”].)

DISPOSITION

The disposition is affirmed.

Jones, P.J.

We concur:

Needham, J.

Bruiniers, J.