

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

a Person Coming Under the Juvenile  
Court Law.

B265830

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. VJ44808)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

DANIEL G.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Kevin L. Brown, Judge. Affirmed.

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

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

---

On June 15, 2015, the police responded to a report that 17-year-old Daniel was in possession of a gun on his high school campus. After being escorted from the classroom, Daniel was searched. An officer found a loaded revolver in Daniel's pants pocket. Based on this information, the People filed a Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 petition, alleging that Daniel had unlawfully possessed a firearm on school grounds in violation of Penal Code section 626.9, subdivision (b). Daniel was detained.<sup>1</sup>

At the conclusion of the jurisdiction hearing, the juvenile court denied Daniel's motion to dismiss under Welfare and Institutions Code section 701.1, found the allegation true, and sustained the petition. At the disposition hearing, the court ordered Daniel to remain a ward of the court, directed him into the short term camp community placement program, and declared the offense a felony. The court calculated the maximum period of confinement as five years eight months.

Daniel timely filed a notice of appeal. We appointed counsel to represent Daniel on appeal. After examining the record, counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues. On November 3, 2015, we advised Daniel he had 30 days to submit any issues he wished us to consider. We have received no response.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that Daniel's appellate attorney has fully complied with the responsibilities of counsel and that 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, 118-119; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441-442.)

---

<sup>1</sup> Approximately two months prior to this incident, the juvenile court sustained a petition filed against Daniel, finding that he made a criminal threat (a felony) and engaged in vandalism (a misdemeanor). Daniel was declared a ward of the court and placed on home probation.

**DISPOSITION**

The order is affirmed.

BLUMENFELD, J.\*

We concur:

PERLUSS, P. J.

ZELON, J.

---

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