

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

B251171  
(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. FJ47413)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

C.R.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Robert Totten, Judge. Affirmed.

Arielle Bases, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Appellant C.R. admitted the allegation that he had committed a robbery in violation of Penal Code section 211. The juvenile court sustained the petition, 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 to camp placement for a term of six months, with a maximum term of confinement of 4 years.

Following his release from camp, appellant failed to report to his probation officer and failed to attend a court hearing. Appellant admitted his violation of probation, the court found the Welfare and Institutions Code section 777 notice of violation true and ordered suitable placement in Rite of Passage of Sierra Ridge.

Appellant appeals from the juvenile court's order. Finding no error, we affirm.

#### Facts

Because appellant admitted committing the robbery, the facts of the robbery are not found in the record. Similarly, appellant admitted violating probation by not reporting to his probation officer and no further details are found in the record.

#### Discussion

Appellant filed a timely notice of appeal, and we appointed counsel to represent him 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 January 23, 2014, we advised appellant he had 30 days in which to personally submit any contentions or issues which he 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 her responsibilities and no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 441.)

Disposition

The juvenile court's order is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

MINK, J.\*

We concur:

MOSK, ACTING P. J.

KRIEGLER, J.

---

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