

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JESSE B.,

Defendant and Appellant.

D065489

(Super. Ct. No. J227257)

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

Johanna S. Schiavoni, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant
and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

In early 2012, the juvenile court declared minor Jesse B. a ward following true
findings on 20 counts of misdemeanor vandalism (Pen. Code, § 594, subds. (a),

(b)(2)(A)). The court ordered more than \$136,000 in restitution to one victim and \$105 in restitution to another victim.

In September 2012, a school bus driver reported that minor Jesse was drinking alcohol on the bus. Jesse entered a negotiated admission to possessing alcohol in public (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 25662, subd. (a)). In October, the juvenile court continued Jesse as a ward, under the supervision of the probation officer; stayed a 90-day commitment to the Short Term Offender Program (STOP); and ordered 30 days of home supervision. In December, the court vacated the commitment to STOP and ordered Jesse placed with his parents. In October 2013, the court terminated the probation officer's supervision and ordered probation to the court. In February 2014, the court terminated jurisdiction. Jesse appeals. We affirm.

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 (*Wende*). Pursuant to *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 (*Anders*) counsel mentions as a possible but not arguable issue whether Jesse filed a timely appeal from the restitution orders.

We granted Jesse 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. Jesse has been competently represented by counsel on this appeal.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

McCONNELL, P. J.

WE CONCUR:

HUFFMAN, J.

HALLER, J.