

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

In re KEVON M., a Person Coming Under  
the Juvenile Court Law.

B240956

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. MJ20664)

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF  
CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

KEVON M.,

Defendant and Appellant.

THE COURT:\*

Minor Kevon M. (minor) appeals the juvenile court's adjudication of a petition filed under Welfare and Institutions Code section 602,<sup>1</sup> alleging he committed first degree residential burglary in violation of Penal Code section 459. His appointed appellate counsel filed a brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436

\*BOREN, P. J., DOI TODD, J., CHAVEZ, J.

<sup>1</sup> All further statutory references are to the Welfare and Institutions Code, unless otherwise stated.

(*Wende*), raising no issues. On August 23, 2012, we gave notice to minor that counsel had failed to find any arguable issues and that minor had 30 days in which to submit by brief or letter any contentions, issues or argument he wished this court to consider. Minor did not submit any brief or letter.

### **BACKGROUND**

At 11:50 p.m. on April 28, 2011, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Deputies Brian Parks and Adam Zeko responded to a burglary in progress call at a residence on East Avenue J-6 in Lancaster. Upon arriving at the scene, Deputy Parks saw five or six young males, including minor, standing outside approximately two houses to the east of the home with the reported alarm. Deputy Parks asked the group if they had seen anyone exit the home where the alarm had sounded. They said they did not. Parks then asked the individuals in the group their respective ages and learned that several, including minor, were under the age of 18.

Deputy Zeko arrived shortly after Deputy Parks. Deputy Zeko went to the residence with the alarm, observed that the kitchen window had been broken and the front door and back sliding door were open; he advised Deputy Parks of his observations.

Deputy Parks observed that one of the youths in the group, Amil H., was wearing a toddler-sized pink Barbie backpack, and protruding from the open top of the backpack was a laptop computer. When Deputy Parks asked Amil H. the brand of the laptop, Amil H. responded that he did not know. Deputy Parks then secured all of the youths by placing them in the back of patrol cars.

Minor testified that as soon as Deputy Parks made contact with the group, he directed everyone to put their hands on the hood of his patrol car and then began reading them their rights. On cross-examination, minor admitted that he acted as a lookout while two others entered the home.

Minor's trial counsel filed a motion to suppress pursuant to section 700.1 on the ground that the sheriff's deputies lacked reasonable suspicion to detain minor and that all

of minor's statements following his detention should be suppressed. The trial court denied the motion, and minor thereafter waived his constitutional rights and admitted the burglary allegation. The juvenile court declared minor a ward of the court and placed him on home probation.

We have reviewed the entire record, and finding no arguable issues, affirm the judgment.

#### **DISPOSITION**

The judgment is affirmed.