

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION SEVEN

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

B254652

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. MJ21712)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ZACHARY P.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Nancy S. Pogue, Temporary Judge. (Pursuant to Cal. Const., art. VI, § 21.) Affirmed.

Stephen Borgo, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

After being called out of class, Zachary P., then 15 years old, acknowledged to a school security guard he possessed a knife. Zachary allowed the guard to retrieve the knife from his pants pocket. The recovered knife had a three inch blade.

The People filed a petition pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 alleging Zachary possessed a weapon on school grounds (Pen. Code, § 626.10, subd. (a)(1)). Following a hearing the juvenile court denied Zachary's motion to suppress evidence (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 700.1). Zachary admitted the allegation, and the court sustained the petition.

At the disposition hearing the juvenile court placed Zachary on probation for six months without declaring wardship pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 725, subdivision (a). Zachary filed a timely notice of appeal. (See *In re Do Kyung K.* (2001) 88 Cal.App.4th 583, 590 [juvenile may appeal order placing him or her on probation].)

We appointed counsel to represent Zachary on appeal. After examination of the record counsel filed an opening brief in which no issues were raised. On May 15, 2014 we advised Zachary he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. On June 11, 2014 we received a typed single-page response in which Zachary expressed remorse for his conduct and described his educational and employment plans.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied Zachary'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.)

DISPOSITION

The order is affirmed.

PERLUSS, P. J.

We concur:

WOODS, J.

SEGAL, J.*

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