

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

DAVID. T.,

Defendant and Appellant.

D063280

(Super. Ct. No. J232499)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Carlos
Armour, Judge. Affirmed.

Reed Webb, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

David T. admitted count 1 in the wardship petition that alleged: "On or about
November 14, 2012, [David T.] did unlawfully commit an assault upon Sedryc

Dees-Mueller with a deadly weapon and instrument, in violation of [Penal Code section 245, subdivision (a)(1)], a felony." Count 2 and all attendant allegations were dismissed. He was declared a ward of the court under section 602 of the Welfare and Institutions Code, and placed on probation subject to a commitment to Breaking Cycles for a period not to exceed 365 days.

David T. appeals. We affirm the judgment.

FACTS

Sedryc Dees-Mueller was seriously injured in a gang fight when stabbed with a knife. David T. initially disclosed to a probation officer and in a letter to the court that he was present at the fight as a member of one of the gangs, but did not personally stab Mr. Dees-Mueller. However, in open court after extensive admonitions by the trial judge, he admitted he stabbed Mr. Dees-Mueller.

DISCUSSION

Appointed appellate counsel has filed a brief summarizing the 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 and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738. Counsel identifies as possible, but not arguable, an issue of "whether the court could proceed with a minor's admission when he denies guilt, both to the probation officer and in a letter addressed to the court, saying that he takes responsibility for the crime on the basis that he was present when it took place and that he now believes that he should not have been there at the time."

We granted David T. permission to file a supplemental brief on his own behalf, but 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 has disclosed no reasonably arguable appellate issues, and David T. has been competently represented by counsel on this appeal.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

McDONALD, J.

WE CONCUR:

McCONNELL, P. J.

O'ROURKE, J.