

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

In re ALEXANDER V., a Person Coming  
Under the Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ALEXANDER V.,

Defendant and Appellant.

G050288

(Super. Ct. No. DL049066)

O P I N I O N

Appeal from orders of the Superior Court of Orange County,  
Julian W. Bailey, Judge. Affirmed.

Kenneth J. Sargoy, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for  
Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

\*

\*

\*

## INTRODUCTION

After Alexander V. unsuccessfully moved to suppress evidence of blood test results, he admitted having driven while under the influence of a drug. The juvenile court found to be true beyond a reasonable doubt that Alexander had driven under the influence in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (a), declared him to be a ward of the court pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 602, and placed him on probation.

Alexander appeals from the dispositional order and the order denying his motion to suppress evidence. Pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*) and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 (*Anders*), appointed counsel filed a brief setting forth the facts of the case and requesting that we review the entire record. Alexander was granted 30 days to file written arguments in his own behalf, but did not file anything.

We have examined the entire record and counsel's *Wende/Anders* brief and have found no reasonably arguable issue. (*Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) We therefore affirm.

## BACKGROUND

In February 2014, wardship proceedings commenced against Alexander, who was then 17 years old. The district attorney filed a petition alleging Alexander committed one misdemeanor count of driving under the influence in violation of Vehicle Code section 23152, subdivision (a) (count 1). The district attorney thereafter amended the petition (the amended petition) to add the allegation that Alexander had committed one misdemeanor count of driving a motor vehicle without a valid license in violation of Vehicle Code section 12500, subdivision (a) (count 2).

Alexander filed a motion to suppress evidence under Welfare and Institutions Code section 700.1, the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, and article I, section 13 of the California Constitution. The motion broadly sought an order suppressing evidence illegally obtained by Irvine Police Officer Sergio Morales.

At the hearing on the motion, Morales testified that at 1:00 a.m. on February 17, 2013, he arrested Alexander for driving under the influence. He transported Alexander to a local hospital “to complete a blood draw” because he suspected Alexander was under the influence of marijuana. A forensic phlebotomist drew Alexander’s blood. Alexander’s counsel argued that the motion to suppress was based on the legality of Morales’s conduct of forcing Alexander to submit to a blood draw following the arrest. After the hearing, the juvenile court denied Alexander’s motion to suppress.

Alexander admitted count 1 of the amended petition; the juvenile court ordered count 2 of the amended petition dismissed on the motion of the district attorney. The juvenile court found the allegations of count 1 true beyond a reasonable doubt, declared Alexander a ward of the juvenile court, and placed him on probation with conditions including that he successfully complete 40 hours of volunteer community service, complete the youthful drunk driver visitation program, and surrender his driver’s license which the court suspended for 365 days. Alexander appealed.

#### ANALYSIS

We have reviewed the record in accordance with our obligations under *Wende* and *Anders*, and we find no reasonably arguable issues on appeal. Alexander himself has not raised any issues for our review. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 120, 124.)

DISPOSITION

The orders are affirmed.

FYBEL, ACTING P. J.

WE CONCUR:

IKOLA, J.

THOMPSON, J.