

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JESUS O.,

Defendant and Appellant.

F073536

(Super. Ct. No. JJD069005)

OPINION

THE COURT*

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Tulare County. Juliet L. Boccone, Judge.

Robert McLaughlin, 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 Peña, Acting P.J., Smith, J. and McCabe, J.†

† Judge of the Merced Superior Court assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article IV, section 6 of the California Constitution.

The court adjudged appellant a ward of the court after it sustained allegations charging appellant Jesus O. with leaving the scene of an accident involving property damage (count III/Veh. Code, § 20002, subd. (a)),¹ a misdemeanor, and driving without a license (count IV/§ 12500, subd. (a)), a misdemeanor. Following independent review of the record pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, we affirm.

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On April 10, 2015, appellant's brother Juan Robles travelled out of town and left his silver 2003 Honda Civic locked and parked in his driveway in Tulare, California, and the car keys on a keychain in his house. The Honda had a license plate number of 7KVC068. At approximately 7:00 p.m. that day, Francisco Amador was stopped at a signal light on Highway 65 in Lindsay when his vehicle was hit in the rear by a light colored Honda. The Honda then backed up and drove off. Amador was able to provide a partial license plate number of "7K" to responding officers and he described the Honda driver as a young Hispanic male. Amador's car suffered damage to the rear where the Honda hit him and to the front from striking a truck that was in front of him. The Honda was eventually found abandoned in an orange orchard near Woodlake.

On April 11, 2015, Robles received a call from the California Highway Patrol advising him that his Honda had been found and that it had damage to its front end. Robles returned from his trip that day and filed a stolen vehicle report with the Lindsay Police Department. Afterwards, Lindsay Police Officer Khevin Riley interviewed appellant at Robles's house. Appellant admitted that the previous night he took Robles's car for a "joy ride." He also stated that he was driving too fast, hit a tree, and left the car in an orange grove near Woodlake. Appellant did not have a driver's license issued to him.

¹ All further statutory references are to the Vehicle Code unless otherwise indicated.

On August 7, 2015, the district attorney filed an amended petition charging appellant with vehicle theft (count 1/§ 10851, subd. (a)), possession of a stolen vehicle (count 2/Pen. Code, § 496d, subd. (a)), failure to stop at an accident (count 3), and driving while being unlicensed (count 4).

On January 13, 2016, the district attorney dismissed counts 1 and 2.

On February 24, 2016, after a contested jurisdictional hearing the court sustained counts 3 and 4.

On March 23, 2016, the court declared appellant a ward of the court and placed him on probation. It also ordered him to pay restitution in an amount to be determined and ordered that his driver's license be delayed for six months.

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.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.