

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

In re ELIJAH J., a Person Coming Under
the Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ELIJAH J.,

Defendant and Appellant.

F064499

(Super. Ct. No. 512412)

OPINION

THE COURT*

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Stanislaus County. Susan D. Siefkin, Judge.

Kristen Owen, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

Office of the State Attorney General, Sacramento, California, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

-ooOoo-

* Before Cornell, Acting P.J., Detjen, J., and Franson, J.

Appellant, Elijah J., admitted allegations in a petition (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 602) charging him with grand theft from a person (Pen. Code, § 487, subd. (c)). Following independent review of the record pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*), we affirm.

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On January 17, 2012, at approximately 12:35 a.m., appellant was with Marc Dillard when he approached Antonia DeLeon and asked to borrow her cell phone. When DeLeon handed appellant the phone, he grabbed her purse, which was on the bench next to DeLeon, and he and Dillard fled with the purse and the phone. Later, DeLeon saw appellant and Dillard a block away going through her purse and yelled at them to give her the phone back. Appellant and Dillard ran away leaving the purse behind and taking the phone and cash with them. When appellant and Dillard were arrested fleeing from the area, appellant was in possession of money belonging to DeLeon.

On January 18, 2012, the district attorney filed a determination that appellant was eligible for deferred entry of judgment and a wardship petition charging appellant with grand theft from a person.

On February 24, 2012, appellant admitted the charged offense.

On March 7, 2012, the probation department issued a report that concluded appellant was not suitable for deferred entry of judgment because he had not been enrolled in school or lived with his parents for the past two years and his actions in the underlying offense displayed a total disregard for the safety of the victim. The report recommended that appellant be adjudged a ward of the court and that he be returned to Oklahoma to live with his mother.

On March 9, 2012, after denying appellant's motion to reduce his offense to a misdemeanor, the court adopted the recommendation of the probation department, adjudged appellant a ward of the court, and placed him on probation. The court also

ordered appellant detained in juvenile hall for 53 days, with credit for 53 days he had already been detained, and that he be released to the custody of his mother.

Appellant's appellate counsel has filed a brief which summarizes the facts, with citations to the record, raises no issues, and asks this court to independently review the record. (*People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) Appellant has not responded to this court's invitation to submit additional briefing.

Following an independent review of the record, we find that no reasonably arguable factual or legal issues exist.

The judgment is affirmed.