

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED

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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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  
THIRD APPELLATE DISTRICT  
(Sacramento)

----

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

THE PEOPLE,  
  
Plaintiff and Respondent,  
  
v.  
  
J.D.,  
  
Defendant and Appellant.

C069789

(Super. Ct. No.  
JV132772)

Minor J.D. (minor) drove a car, without a license, and while fleeing from the police hit juvenile victim T.M.'s car with T.M. and others inside. Minor claims the juvenile court abused its discretion by ordering him to pay restitution in the amount of \$6,672.66 to cover T.M.'s cost to repair his car rather than its \$3,000 purchase price. We disagree and shall affirm the restitution order.

**FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

On April 22, 2011, California Highway Patrol officers attempted to stop a car driven by minor; minor accelerated to over 80 miles per hour, ran four stop signs, and collided with a 1996 Ford Ranger occupied by juvenile victims T.M. and two others.

On July 13, 2011, minor admitted charges of evading a peace officer by means of a vehicle chase (Veh. Code, § 2800.2, subd. (a)), driving without a license (Veh. Code, § 12500, subd. (a)), and driving without proof of insurance (Veh. Code, § 16028, subd. (a)). He was found suitable for deferred entry of judgment (DEJ). His admission to DEJ was held in abeyance pending completion of a probation-supervised program and restitution was ordered in an amount to be determined.

On November 3, 2011, the juvenile court conducted the restitution hearing. At that hearing, T.M. submitted documentation showing he had purchased his 1996 Ford Ranger in February 2011, for \$3,000. T.M. also submitted an estimate from Mel Rapton Collision Center showing that repair of the Ranger, with an odometer reading of 146,005 miles, would cost \$6,672.66. Minor objected to any amount of restitution exceeding the \$3,000 purchase price. The juvenile court ordered the minor to pay the \$6,672.66 cost of repair.

#### **DISCUSSION**

Minor contends the juvenile court's restitution order of \$6,672.66 was an abuse of discretion because the order was significantly higher than the \$3,000 replacement value of the Ranger, thereby constituting a windfall to T.M.

In *People v. Stanley* (2012) 54 Cal.4th 734, the California Supreme Court rejected this contention in a nearly identical fact pattern. We are bound to reject it as well. (See *Auto Equity Sales, Inc. v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 450, 455.)

**DISPOSITION**

The restitution order is affirmed.

\_\_\_\_\_  
DUARTE, J.

We concur:

\_\_\_\_\_  
BLEASE, Acting P. J.

\_\_\_\_\_  
HULL, J.