

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JULIAN H.,

Defendant and Appellant.

D062042

(Super. Ct. No. J228973)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Carolyn Caietti, Judge. Affirmed.

Julian H. was charged by petition with violating San Diego County Code of Regulatory Ordinances sections 62.669.1 (§ 62.669.1) and 62.669, subd. (a). These alleged violations, which arose from a dog bite incident, occurred on June 6, 2010, when appellant was a minor.

On April 5, 2012, Julian admitted he violated Section 62.669.1 (unlawfully failing to prevent his dog from injuring another person). The juvenile court found appellant understood the nature of the proceedings, and that he made a knowing, intelligent, voluntary waiver of his constitutional rights. The court sustained the petition, dismissed the other charge and set the matter for disposition.

At disposition, Julian was adjudged a ward of the court and granted probation. At a subsequent restitution hearing, the court imposed a stipulated victim restitution order in the amount of \$996.60.

FACTS¹

Tina Souza, the victim of the dog bite, reported that she was walking in an alley when she noticed a dog, a pit bull, running towards her. A boy, later identified as Julian, was 50 feet behind the dog. Not knowing if the dog was aggressive, she yelled for appellant to get his dog. The dog then lunged up for her throat. She turned her back on the dog, who jumped on her, knocking her to the ground. The dog latched on to her left arm, which she had placed over her face to protect herself. She sustained a 10-centimeter by six-centimeter wound to her forearm, which required multiple sutures and follow-up care. Appellant pulled the dog off her arm and left the area. A witness claimed appellant told him he "sicked" the dog on Souza. Appellant denied this, but admitted the dog was his, that the dog's collar "broke open" and that he saw his dog bite Souza.

¹ The facts are taken from the probation officer's social study.

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 that this court 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 a possible, but not arguable, issue: whether the court erred in denying appellant's motion to dismiss for violation of appellant's right to a speedy trial.

We granted Julian permission to file a brief on his own behalf. He 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 issue referred to by appellate counsel, has disclosed no reasonably arguable issue. Competent counsel has represented Julian on this appeal.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

HALLER, J.

WE CONCUR:

NARES, Acting P. J.

MCINTYRE, J.