

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

CESAR L.,

Defendant and Appellant.

F067076

(Stanislaus Super. Ct. No. 513278)

OPINION

THE COURT*

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Stanislaus County. Shawn D. Bessey, Judge.

Rex Adam Williams, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

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

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

-ooOoo-

INTRODUCTION

Appellant Cesar L., a minor, was declared a ward of the juvenile court (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 602) based on his admission of three counts of misdemeanor vandalism (Pen. Code,¹ § 594, subd. (b)(2)(A)). On appeal, his 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* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*)). We affirm.

FACTS²

At 2:40 a.m. on March 16, 2013, officers contacted appellant and two adult males as they walked along Railroad Avenue in Ceres. All three were wearing dark clothes, carrying backpacks, and had fresh paint on their hands and wrists. One man was in possession of spray paint nozzles and half-empty cans of spray paint. Appellant, who was 16 years old, was arrested for a curfew violation. Appellant and the other two men admitted they had been “tagging.” The officers found freshly-painted graffiti in the same style in numerous locations along Railroad Avenue.

Appellant later admitted he associated with a “tagging crew.” Appellant said he tagged “TBC,” which meant “To be continued.”

Appellant’s admissions and the dispositional orders

On March 19, 2013, a juvenile petition was filed in the Superior Court of Stanislaus County which alleged appellant committed eight counts of misdemeanor vandalism (§ 594, subd. (b)(2)(A)).

¹ All further statutory citations are to the Penal Code unless otherwise indicated.

² Given defendant’s no contest pleas, the facts are taken from the probation report.

On March 26, 2013, appellant admitted three misdemeanor counts and the court dismissed the other allegations. Thereafter, the court conducted the dispositional hearing and declared appellant a ward of the court. It placed appellant on probation subject to certain terms and conditions, including that he could not be a member of any tagging crew; participate in any tagging crew activity; or associate or communicate with any person known by him, or identified by his parent, guardian, or probation officer, to be a member of a tagging crew. The court placed appellant in juvenile hall for 45 days, with the last 15 days to be served at home.

On April 15, 2013, appellant filed a timely notice of appeal.

DISCUSSION

As noted *ante*, appellant's counsel has filed a *Wende* brief with this court. The brief also includes the declaration of appellate counsel indicating that appellant was advised he could file his own brief with this court. By letter on June 14, 2013, we invited defendant to submit additional briefing. To date, he has not done so.

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

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.