Filed 8/22/12 In re B.A. CA4/1

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In re B.A., a Person Coming Under the Juvenile Court Law.	
THE PEOPLE, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. B.A., Defendant and Appellant.	D060424 (Super. Ct. No. J219756)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Margie G. Woods, Judge. Affirmed.

B.A., a minor, was charged by petition with assault by means of force likely to produce great bodily harm (Pen. Code, § 245, subd. (a)(1); count 1)[1]; willful and unlawful use of force and violence resulting in the infliction of serious bodily injury

1 Further statutory references are also to the Penal Code unless otherwise specified.

(§ 243, subd. (d); count 2); and attempt to prevent and dissuade a victim and witness of a crime from making a report (§ 136.1, subd. (b)(1); count 3).

B.A. entered a settlement agreement under which she admitted to counts 1 and 3. The juvenile court found B.A. understood the nature of the conduct alleged, the possible consequences of her admission, and her admission was freely and voluntarily given. The court sustained the petition on counts 1 and 3 and dismissed count 2. The court declared B.A. a ward under Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 and placed her in the Youthful Offender Unit (Y.O.U) program for a period not to exceed 480 days. The court, however, stayed commitment for three months, placed B.A. on home supervision through the electronic surveillance program, and ordered her not to use a computer for purposes other than school work or social media such as Facebook.

A few weeks later, B.A. violated the terms of her home confinement through unauthorized computer use and extensive use of Facebook. The court lifted the stay on the order to the Y.O.U program.

FACTS

B.A. and B.G., both teenagers, were supposedly friends. On May 3, 2011, B.A. invited B.G. to her house to "hang out." B.A. led B.G. to the back yard, where B.A.'s older sister waited. The sister began videotaping the girls with her cell phone. During the videotaping, B.A. hit B.G. in the face with a closed fist, causing her to fall to the ground. She momentarily lost consciousness and B.A. pulled her hair and kicked her in the face. B.G. was taken to a hospital. She "had swelling around her eyes and some

blood coming from her nose and her left eyebrow." B.A. sent B.G. a text message telling her not to contact the police.

B.A. bragged about the incident by posting the videotape on Facebook. Further, B.A. had posted messages on Facebook before the incident indicating she intended to assault someone. B.A. has history of criminal activity, and she was on parole on two cases when the incident took place.

DISCUSSION

Appointed appellate counsel has filed a brief summarizing the facts and proceedings at the juvenile court. Counsel presents no argument for reversal, but asks this court to review the record for error as mandated by *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436. Pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, counsel refers to as possible but not arguable issues: (1) whether the court erred by not advising B.A. as to the maximum term of confinement on count 2; (2) whether the court abused its discretion by lifting the stay on the Y.O.U. commitment; and (3) whether the court erred by not stating an award of custody credits in the minute orders.

We gave B.A. the opportunity to file a brief on her own behalf. She has not responded.

A review of the record pursuant to *People v. Wende*, *supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436, and *Anders v. California*, *supra*, 386 U.S. 738, including the possible issues to which counsel referred, has disclosed no reasonably arguable appellate issues. Counsel adequately represented B.A. on appeal.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

MCCONNELL, P. J.

WE CONCUR:

BENKE, J.

AARON, J.