

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

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

B246684  
(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. VJ40601)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

C.C.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from orders of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Fumiko Wasserman, Judge. Affirmed.

Bruce G. Finebaum, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

The juvenile court sustained a petition alleging appellant C.C. committed petty theft in violation of Penal Code section 484, subdivision (a), a misdemeanor. The court found appellant was a person described by Welfare and Institutions Code section 602, adjudged appellant to be a ward of the court, and ordered appellant committed to the joint supervision of the Probation Department and the Department of Child and Family Services (“DCFS”) for suitable placement.

## FACTS

On October 10, 2010, at approximately 4:00 p.m., Downey Police Department Officer Bryan Chaidez went to the loss prevention office of the Kohl’s department store in the Stonewood Mall in response to a call. There, he met loss prevention officer Alfred Retana and appellant.

Retana gave Officer Chaidez a DVD containing video of the incident and a report. Officer Chaidez learned Retana had detained appellant after watching her via a closed circuit-security camera system and observing her approach a display, place an object an object in her bag, and walk away from the display. Retana found a “Tinkerbell” watch from the display in appellant’s bag.

Officer Chaidez took appellant to the police station. There, he read her *Miranda*<sup>1</sup> rights to her. She told him her sister wanted the watch and asked appellant to steal it for her. After several requests from her sister, appellant took the watch from the display and hid it in her bag. The interview was not recorded.

Gilbert Escobar, a loss prevention officer from the Stonewood Mall Kohl’s store, explained that loss prevention officers monitor the store’s surveillance cameras for suspicious activity. Escobar identified the area shown in the video as the Juniors Department of his store, covered by camera 3. In his experience, the date and time stamp on the camera was accurate.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Miranda v. Arizona* (1966) 384 U.S. 436.

Following the testimony in this matter, the juvenile court viewed the surveillance video of appellant's activities. A booking photograph of appellant from the day of the incident was introduced into evidence, showing her appearance that day.

#### DISCUSSION

Appellant filed a timely notice of appeal, and we appointed counsel to represent her on appeal. Appellant's counsel filed an opening brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, and requested this court to independently review the record on appeal to determine whether any arguable issues exist.

On June 5, 2013, we advised appellant she had 30 days in which to personally submit any contentions or issues which she wished us to consider. No response has been received to date.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied appellant's attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 441.)

DISPOSITION

The juvenile court's orders are affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

KUMAR, J.\*

We concur:

TURNER, P.J.

KRIEGLER, J.

---

\* Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.