

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

TREVON H.,

Defendant and Appellant.

D062924

(Super. Ct. No. J231469)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Browder  
A. Willis III, Judge. Affirmed.

Trevon H. entered a negotiated admission to having committed two residential burglaries (Pen. Code, §§ 459, 460; counts 1 and 3). The court declared him a ward and committed him to the Breaking Cycles Short Term Offender Program for a period not to exceed 90 days. Trevon appeals. We affirm.

## BACKGROUND

In February 2012, Trevon burglarized Mr. A.'s home (count 3). In May, Trevon burglarized Ms. K.'s home (count 1).

Mr. A. requested restitution of \$7,549 for property taken and damaged during the burglary. Trevon's counsel did not contest the amount of the claim, and the court ordered Trevon to pay restitution in that amount.

Ms. K. initially requested restitution of \$2,180 for property taken and damaged during the burglary. At the restitution hearing, she increased her request to \$3,044.80. Trevon's counsel argued that the appropriate amount of restitution was \$2,750.27. In rebuttal, the prosecutor argued that the restitution order should be \$15.13 more than that amount, and Trevon's counsel conceded the point. The court ordered Trevon to pay Ms. K. \$2,765.40.

The court also ordered Trevon to pay \$897.06 in restitution to the victim in another residential burglary count that was dismissed with a *Harvey* waiver (*People v. Harvey* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 754), and \$126 to Vintage Realty for a window broken during one of the burglaries.

## DISCUSSION

Appointed appellate counsel has filed a brief summarizing the facts and proceedings below. 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 (*Wende*). Pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 (*Anders*), counsel lists,

as a possible, but not arguable, issue: whether the court ordered the appropriate restitution.

We granted Trevon permission to file a brief on his own behalf. He has not responded. A review of the record pursuant to *Wende* and *Anders*, including the possible issue listed pursuant to *Anders*, has disclosed no reasonably arguable appellate issue.

Trevon has been competently represented by counsel on this appeal.

#### DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

AARON, J.

WE CONCUR:

McDONALD, Acting P. J.

O'ROURKE, J.