

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

In re LORENZO G., a Person Coming  
Under the Juvenile Court Law.

B238956

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. MJ20626)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

LORENZO G.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County.

Mitchel J. Harris, Juvenile Court Referee. Dismissed.

Kevin D. Sheehy, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

In March 2011, police took then 13-year-old Lorenzo G. into custody for felony vandalism after he admitted defacing City of Palmdale and Palmdale School District property with graffiti on various occasions in 2010 and 2011. In May 2011, the People filed a Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 petition against Lorenzo, alleging six counts of felony vandalism.<sup>1</sup> (Pen. Code, § 594, subd. (a).)

On October 25, 2011, the juvenile court granted Lorenzo's motion for discovery of the arresting officer's personnel files pursuant to Evidence Code sections 1043 and 1045 and *Pitchess v. Superior Court* (1974) 11 Cal.3d 531 (*Pitchess*). The court conducted an in camera review of that officer's personnel and administrative records for complaints concerning "coerced confessions," and found no relevant material.<sup>2</sup>

On January 25, 2012, the juvenile court heard Lorenzo's motion to suppress the statements he made to the arresting officer on grounds the officer failed to advise him of his right to remain silent, to the presence of an attorney and, if indigent, to appointed counsel (*Miranda v. Arizona* (1966) 384 U.S. 436 [86 S.Ct. 1602, 16 L.Ed.2d 694]) and coerced him to admit the acts of vandalism of city and school district property. The same day, following the court's denial of the motion, Lorenzo admitted two of the alleged counts of vandalism and agreed to pay victim restitution resulting from all six counts of vandalism, pursuant to a *Harvey* waiver (*People v. Harvey* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 754; the amount of the restitution was to be determined at a restitution hearing. Prior to his admission, Lorenzo was advised of and waived his constitutional rights. The court found Lorenzo's waivers and admissions were knowing, voluntary and intelligent, and the conditions of *In re Gladys R.* (1970) 1 Cal.3d 855 were satisfied. The court dismissed the remaining counts, ordered probation on specified conditions and granted deferred entry of

---

<sup>1</sup> Angel D., who was found to have committed the acts of vandalism with Lorenzo, is not a party to this appeal.

<sup>2</sup> The transcript of the in camera hearing is not part of the record on appeal.

judgment for not less than 12 months and not more than 36 months. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 790.) The court also scheduled a restitution hearing.

On February 7, 2012, Lorenzo filed a notice of appeal from the January 25, 2012 order for deferred entry of judgment. We appointed counsel to represent him on appeal.

After an examination of the record, counsel filed an opening brief in which no issues were raised. On May 4, 2012, we advised Lorenzo he had 30 days in which to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. No response has been received to date.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied Lorenzo's attorney has fully complied with the responsibilities of counsel and no arguable issues exist. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 277-284 [120 S.Ct. 746, 145 L.Ed.2d 756]; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 112-113; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

The January 25, 2012 order for deferred entry of judgment and probation is not appealable. (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 800; *People v. Mazurette* (2001) 24 Cal.4th 789, 794; *In re Mario C.* (2004) 124 Cal.App.4th 1303, 1307-1309.) Accordingly, the appeal is dismissed.

ZELON, J.

We concur:

PERLUSS, P. J.

JACKSON, J.