

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

In re V.W., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

B234200
(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. MJ16983)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

V.W.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County.

Catherine J. Pratt and Robin R. Kesler, Juvenile Court Referees. Affirmed.

Jonathan E. Demson, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

V.W. appeals from the judgment after the juvenile court found him to be a probationer in possession of a firearm under former Penal Code section 12021, subd. (d)(1) [now Pen. Code § 29815, subd. (a)] and sentenced him to camp placement for a term of nine months with a maximum period of confinement of six years eight months.

We appointed counsel to represent appellant in this matter. After examining the record, counsel filed a “*Wende*” brief raising no issues on appeal and requesting that we independently review the record. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) Counsel reserved the right to brief any *Pitchess* issue that might appear from our independent review of the record. We directed appointed counsel to immediately send the record on this appeal and a copy of the opening brief to appellant and notified appellant that within 30 days from the date of the notice he could submit by brief or letter any grounds of appeal, contentions or argument he wished us to consider. We received no response from appellant.

We have examined the entire record including the confidential material from the *Pitchess* hearing and are satisfied that appellant’s attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities, that no arguable issue exists (*People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 441) and there is no basis for disturbing the court’s *Pitchess* ruling. (*People v. Mooc* (2001) 26 Cal.4th 1216, 1229.) We set out below a brief description of the facts and procedural history of the case, the crimes of which the appellant was convicted, and the punishment imposed. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 110.)

Deputy Sheriff Sam Dang testified that he and his partner were directed to a home in Compton to investigate a case of domestic violence. When they arrived they saw V.W. standing in the driveway with a duffle bag on his shoulder. The deputies detained V.W. based on the domestic violence call. Deputy Dang observed the barrel of a shotgun poking out of the duffle bag that V.W. was carrying. A field inspection showed that the gun was unloaded but appeared to be in working condition.

V.W. testified that when the deputies arrived at his home they handcuffed him and placed him in the back of their patrol car. While sitting in the car he saw the deputies search a Jeep that was parked in the driveway. He did not see the deputies retrieve a

shotgun but one of the deputies came to him as he sat in the car, showed him the gun and asked him if he knew whose it was. V.W. replied that he did not know.

The court found true the allegation that V.W. was a probationer in possession of a dangerous weapon in violation of a condition of his probation. As noted, the court sentenced V.W. to camp placement for a term of nine months with a maximum period of confinement of six years eight months.

Prior to the hearing on the juvenile petition the court granted V.W.'s motion for discovery of the Sheriffs Department's personnel records of Deputies Dang and Luna and after conducting an in camera hearing found nothing in their records regarding fabrication of reports or evidence. We have independently reviewed the record of the in camera hearing and conclude there is no basis to disturb the court's decision. (*People v. Mooc, supra*, 26 Cal.4th at p. 1229.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

ROTHSCHILD, Acting P. J.

We concur:

CHANEY, J.

JOHNSON, J.