

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

In re D.W., a Person Coming Under the
Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

D.W.,

Defendant and Appellant.

E056604

(Super.Ct.No. RIJ116959)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of Riverside County. F. Paul Dickerson III,
Judge. Affirmed.

Susan S. Bauguess, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Defendant and appellant D.W. (minor) admitted that he committed robbery (Pen. Code, § 211) as alleged in a subsequent Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 petition. Minor was thereafter continued as a ward of the court and committed to the Riverside County Probation Department's residential treatment center (Youth Offender Program). Minor later filed a motion to withdraw his admission, claiming he did not understand his admission to a strike offense would follow him beyond juvenile court. Minor appeals from the denial of the motion to withdraw his admission. We find no error and affirm the judgment.

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On April 13, 2010, 11-year-old K.D. and 12-year-old C.G. rode their bikes to a store to get something to drink. While C.G. went into the store, K.D. remained outside with the bicycles. She was approached by two juvenile Black males, who forcibly took both bicycles from K.D.'s grasp and rode off. Police were subsequently notified.

After speaking with a security guard from a neighboring store, an email was sent to Hemet Police Department Officers to watch out for the stolen bicycles. Later that evening, officers saw a group of 10 Black males loitering near an identified problem area of the city. One of the males was riding a bicycle matching the description of one of the stolen bikes. The male was stopped, and informed the officers that he did not know who owned the bicycle. Minor and three additional suspects were detained. In an in-field lineup, the victims identified minor as one of the people who took the bicycles. Minor was arrested. He admitted to taking a bicycle, and also acknowledged that what he did was wrong.

On November 22, 2010, a subsequent petition pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 was filed, charging minor with robbery. (Pen. Code, § 211.)

On June 30, 2011, minor admitted the allegation, and the juvenile court found the allegation as admitted true. The juvenile court also found that the admission was entered into freely and voluntarily; that minor knowingly and intelligently waived his rights; and that minor understood the nature of the conduct alleged and the possible consequences. Minor was thereafter continued a ward of the court and committed to the Youth Offender Program with credit of 77 days for time served. The maximum term of confinement, including a prior petition, was set at eight years eight months.

On April 25, 2012, minor filed a motion to withdraw his admission on the ground that his admission was not voluntarily and intelligently made; that the admission was taken without a full understanding of the direct consequences of his admission; and that he did not understand his admission to a strike offense would follow him beyond juvenile court.

A hearing on the motion was held on May 24, 2012. Following argument from the parties, the motion was denied. The juvenile court found that minor knowingly and intelligently waived his rights; that minor understood the waiver; and that minor had been advised of the possible consequences of admitting to a strike offense.

On June 28, 2012, minor filed a notice of appeal from the denial of his motion to withdraw his admission.

DISCUSSION

Minor appealed and, upon his request, this court appointed counsel to represent him. Counsel has filed a brief under the authority of *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738, setting forth a statement of the case, a summary of the facts and potential arguable issues, and requesting this court conduct an independent review of the record.

We offered defendant an opportunity to file a personal supplemental brief, but he has not done so. Pursuant to the mandate of *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, we have independently reviewed the record for potential error and find no arguable issues.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

RAMIREZ

P. J.

We concur:

RICHLI

J.

KING

J.