

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

RICHARD M.,

Defendant and Appellant.

F069974

(Super. Ct. No. 513410)

OPINION

THE COURT*

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Stanislaus County. Valli
Israels, Judge.

Randall H. Conner, 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 Levy, Acting P.J., Kane, J. and Smith, J.

FACTS AND PROCEEDINGS

In September 2013, when appellant Richard M. was 17 years old, a petition was filed pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 alleging he committed the misdemeanor offenses of hit and run with a vehicle (Veh. Code, § 20002, subd. (a), count 1) and resisting, delaying, or obstructing a peace officer (Pen. Code, § 148, subd. (a), count 2). At the conclusion of a contested jurisdiction hearing on January 30, 2014, the juvenile court found both allegations true. On February 20, 2014, the juvenile court placed appellant on informal probation upon various terms and conditions, including that he attend counseling sessions and 20 hours of community service. Appellant did not file a timely appeal from the orders of the juvenile court.

On August 13, 2014, the probation department filed a notice pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 777 alleging that appellant failed to attend any classes in a counseling program and 2.5 hours of his community service obligation. The probation department recommended that appellant spend 30 days on the electronic monitoring program.

On August 14, 2014, the probation officer stipulated that appellant had finished his 20 hours of community service. Appellant was advised of and waived his rights to a contested hearing. Appellant admitted violating the terms of his probation by failing to complete the counseling program.

The court ordered appellant on the electronic monitoring program for 30 days. The court continued appellant on his wardship and placed him on probation. One additional term of probation was that appellant not affiliate with or communicate with anyone known by him to be a gang member.¹ Appellant was ordered to complete the

¹ There was testimony at the disposition hearing from appellant's probation officer that during a search of appellant's residence she found red and black clothing associated with Norteño gang members in appellant's bedroom. Photographs of the clothing were admitted as exhibits. Also, appellant had been served with a permanent gang injunction. The probation officer believed that a gang term of probation would assist in rehabilitating appellant.

counseling program. Appellant was given two days of custody credits and had to remain on electronic monitoring for 28 days. Appellant filed a timely notice of appeal.

Appellate counsel has filed a brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*). We affirm the orders of the juvenile court.

APPELLATE COURT REVIEW

Appellant's appointed appellate counsel has filed an opening brief that summarizes the pertinent facts, raises no issues, and requests this court to review the record independently. (*Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) By letter dated December 17, 2014, we invited appellant to submit additional briefing. To date, he has not done so.

After independent review of the record, we have concluded there are no reasonably arguable legal or factual issues.

DISPOSITION

The orders of the juvenile court are affirmed.