

S 230923

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In re Ricardo P.

A minor.

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
 Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

Ricardo P.,
 Defendant and Appellant.

No. S _____

(Court of Appeal
 No. A144149;
 Alameda County
 Superior
 Court No.
 SJ1423676)

SUPREME COURT
 FILED

DEC - 1 2015

Frank A. McGuire Clerk

 Deputy

APPELLANT'S PETITION FOR REVIEW

After a Published Decision, Filed on October 22, 2015 by the Court of
 Appeal, First District, Division One

MEGAN HAILEY-DUNSHEATH
 Attorney at Law
 1563 Solano Avenue, #457
 Berkeley, CA 94707
 Telephone: 510-853-0529
 Email: megan.hailey.dunsheath@
 gmail.com
 State Bar Number 230846

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In re Ricardo P.

A minor.

PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

Ricardo P.,

Defendant and Appellant.

No. S _____

(Court of Appeal
No. A144149;
Alameda County
Superior
Court No.
SJ1423676)

APPELLANT'S PETITION FOR REVIEW

After a Published Decision, Filed on October 22, 2015 by the Court of
Appeal, First District, Division One

MEGAN HAILEY-DUNSHEATH
Attorney at Law
1563 Solano Avenue, #457
Berkeley, CA 94707
Telephone: 510-853-0529
Email: megan.hailey.dunsheath@
gmail.com
State Bar Number 230846

Table of Contents

Table of Authorities.....	ii
Issues Presented for Review.....	2
Reasons for Granting Review.....	2
Statement of the Case and Facts.....	4
Argument.....	6
I. THE COURT OF APPEAL ERRED IN FINDING THE ELECTRONICS SEARCH CONDITION VALID UNDER <i>PEOPLE V. LENT</i>	6
A. Introduction	6
B. The Court of Appeal’s Misapplication of <i>Olguin</i> Eviscerates <i>Lent</i>	8
Conclusion.....	13
Certificate of Counsel.....	14

Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>Ginns v. Savage</i> (1964) 61 Cal.2d 520	10
<i>In re D.G.</i> (2010) 187 Cal.App.4th 47	11
<i>In re Erica R.</i> (2015) 240 Cal.App.4th 907	3, 11, 12
<i>In re J.B.</i> (Nov. 25, 2015, A144396) 2015 WL 7567726.....	3, 12
<i>In re Sheena K.</i> (2007) 40 Cal.4th 875.....	12
<i>In re Tyrell J.</i> (1994) 8 Cal.4th 68.....	11
<i>In re Brandão</i> (2012) 210 Cal.App.4th. 568	12
<i>People v. Lent</i> (1975) 15 Cal.3d 481	passim
<i>People v. Olguin</i> (2008) 45 Cal.4th 375.....	passim

Statutes

Pen. Code § 459.....	4
Pen. Code § 460(a)	4
Pen. Code § 632.....	6
Wel. and Inst. Code § 602	4

Rules of Court

Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.500(b)(1)	2
---	---

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In re Ricardo P.	No. S _____
A minor.	(Court of Appeal No. A144149; Alameda County Superior Court No. SJ1423676)
PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, Plaintiff and Respondent,	
v.	
Ricardo P.,	
Defendant and Appellant.	

TO THE HONORABLE TANI CANTIL-SAKAUYE, CHIEF JUSTICE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, AND TO THE HONORABLE ASSOCIATE JUSTICES OF THE COURT:

Ricardo P. petitions this Court for review following the published decision of the Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division One, filed on October 22, 2015, holding that the probation condition imposed in his case was not invalid under *People v. Lent* (1975) 15 Cal.3d 481.¹

¹ A copy of the Court of Appeal's opinion is attached at Appendix A.

ISSUES PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

- I. Is a juvenile probation condition, the sole purpose of which is to facilitate general supervision of the minor, reasonably related to future criminality and thus valid under *People v. Lent* (1975) 15 Cal.3d 481?

- II. Is a probation condition requiring a juvenile to submit his electronic devices for search at any time and requiring submission of his social media and electronics passwords to the probation department valid under *People v. Lent* where there is no indication electronic devices had ever been used by the minor for illegal or harmful activity?

REASONS FOR GRANTING REVIEW

Review of the issues in this case is necessary both to secure uniformity of decision and to settle an important question of law. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.500(b)(1).) This case raises a significant issue regarding the interpretation of the third prong of the test this Court established 40 years ago in *People v. Lent* (1975) 15 Cal.3d 481 – that a probation condition forbidding conduct not reasonably related to future criminality is invalid.² In this case, the Court of Appeal’s treatment of this Court’s interpretation of the third prong in *People v. Olguin* (2008) 45 Cal.4th 375, finding valid any probation condition that enhances effective supervision of probationers, renders the third prong of *Lent* meaningless

² A probation condition is invalid if it “(1) has no relationship to the crime of which the offender was convicted, (2) relates to conduct which is not in itself criminal, and (3) requires or forbids conduct which is not reasonably related to future criminality.” (*People v. Lent, supra*, 15 Cal.3d at p. 486.)

and constitutes a departure from established principles set forth by this Court. While the challenged condition in this case specifically involves warrantless searches of a juvenile's electronic devices and social media accounts, the Court of Appeal's extreme rendering of *Olguin* will have far reaching implications if followed by other courts in evaluating the reasonableness of probation conditions for both juveniles and adults.

Review should also be granted because the Court of Appeal's published opinion directly contradicts two other published opinions from different divisions of the First District – *In re Erica R.* (1st Dist., Div. 2, 2015) 240 Cal.App.4th 907, and *In re J.B.* (1st Dist., Div. 2, Nov. 25, 2015, A144396) 2015 WL 7567726 – which held the same probation condition invalid under *Lent* in similar factual situations.

Since this issue is likely to continue to arise, review in this case would be appropriate in order to clarify the relationship between this Court's holding in *Olguin* and the third prong of the *Lent* test as well as the validity of electronics search conditions in juvenile cases where the original offense did not involve electronics or social media usage.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE AND FACTS

On September 18, 2014, a Santa Clara County Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 petition was filed alleging two felony violations of Penal Code section 459/460(a) (First Degree Burglary). (CT 18, 20.)³

The charges stemmed from two incidents that occurred between 10:00 am and noon on February 24, 2014, in San Jose.⁴ In the first incident, three individuals were seen entering a home through a sliding glass door. A resident of the home came through the front door, and all three individuals left out the back door without taking anything. (CT 14, 122-124.) A surveillance video showed the three individuals enter and leave the house. (CT 125.)

In the second incident, a neighbor saw two individuals break a glass sliding door to enter a house; a video recording also captured the individuals breaking the door. (CT 12-13, 61, 68.) Several items of costume jewelry with a total value of \$200 were taken. (CT 13, 58, 70.) Ricardo and two of his adult cousins were arrested soon afterwards. (CT 41, 52, 63.) Ricardo was positively identified by a witness to one of the break-ins. (CT 77.) Ricardo's two adult co-defendants were sentenced to

³ "CT" refers to the Clerk's Transcript on Appeal and "RT" to the Reporter's Transcript of Proceedings.

⁴ These facts were taken from the probation reports and San Jose Police Department reports.

state prison for two and three years. (CT 140.)

On October 9, 2014, Ricardo admitted to both counts. (CT 5, 8.) On November 4, 2014, the petition was transferred to Alameda County, Ricardo's county of residence. (11/4/2014 RT 2.) On December 15, 2014, Ricardo was made a ward of the court, placed on probation, and placed in the custody of his mother. (12/15/2014 RT 3.) The probation conditions imposed included a requirement that Ricardo submit to a search of "electronics including passwords." (12/15/2014 RT 4; CT 148.) Defense counsel objected to the condition requiring Ricardo to submit electronic devices to search and that he provide his passwords. (12/15/2014 RT 5.)

A timely notice of appeal was filed on January 26, 2015. (CT 168.)

On October 22, 2015, the Court of Appeal issued its published opinion and ordered the probation condition modified. (Appendix A.)

ARGUMENT

I.

THE COURT OF APPEAL ERRED IN FINDING THE ELECTRONICS SEARCH CONDITION VALID UNDER *PEOPLE V. LENT*.

A. Introduction

In 2014, Ricardo admitted two felony violations of first degree burglary. The offenses were not drug-related, but in his conversations with the probation department, Ricardo admitted occasional marijuana use. Because of his prior marijuana use, the court imposed probation conditions that included drug testing, warrantless search of Ricardo's person and property, and an order that he stay away from known drug users. The court also imposed, over Ricardo's objection, a condition requiring him to submit to search of his electronic devices and ordered him to provide his electronics passwords to the probation department. (12/15/2014 RT 5.) The court justified the condition on the basis that some teenagers boast about their drug use on social media, and thus monitoring Ricardo's communications on social media would assist the probation department ensure Ricardo was not violating probation by using drugs. (12/15/2014 RT 5; Appendix A, pp. 3-4.)

On appeal, Ricardo challenged the electronics search condition as unreasonable under *Lent*, unconstitutionally overbroad, and permitting illegal eavesdropping in violation of Penal Code section 632. The Court of

Appeal agreed the condition as written was unconstitutionally overbroad and struck the phrase “electronics including passwords” from the warrantless search condition. (Appendix A, p. 17.) The Court of Appeal indicated that on remand, the juvenile court could impose a condition requiring searches of a “narrower range of electronic information” that would be “reasonably likely to reveal whether Ricardo is boasted about his drug use...such as text and voicemail messages, photographs, e-mails, and social-media accounts.” (Appendix A, pp. 17-18.)

The Court of Appeal, however, also found the probation condition reasonable under the third prong of the *Lent* test because “the electronics search condition is reasonably related to enabling the effective supervision of Ricardo’s compliance with” other probation conditions. (Appendix A, p. 10.) The court reasoned that “[u]nless our state Supreme Court departs from its holding in *Olguin*, we are bound to accept the principle that conditions reasonably related to enhancing the effective supervision of a probationer are valid under *Lent*.” (Appendix A, p. 10.) The court’s broad interpretation of *Olguin*, which addressed only the safety of probation officers, to *any* possible probation condition that enhances supervision is without precedent and renders the third prong of *Lent* meaningless.

B. The Court of Appeal’s Misapplication of *Olguin* Eviscerates *Lent*

In *People v. Lent*, this Court established a three-prong test to evaluate the validity of a challenged probation condition; all three prongs must be satisfied for a probation condition to be deemed invalid. The Court of Appeal agreed with appellant on the first two prongs, but held that the probation condition passed the test set forth in *People v. Lent* because “the third prong required to invalidate a probation condition – that the condition forbids conduct unrelated to future criminality – is *not* satisfied.” (Appendix A, p. 9.) The court agreed with appellant that nothing in the record permitted “an inference that electronics [including cell phones] played a role” in appellant’s offense (Appendix A, p. 8), but found persuasive the Attorney General’s contention that the electronics search condition would enable the probation department to “monitor and enforce compliance” with other conditions designed to address appellant’s marijuana use and potential contact with his two adult co-defendants.⁵ (Appendix A, p. 10). The court suggested that “allowing text messages or Internet activity to be reviewed” would allow the probation department to “assess whether Ricardo is communicating about drugs or with people

⁵ As noted in the record, appellant’s two co-defendants were given state prison sentences and cannot be contacted via electronic devices, so the electronics search provision cannot enable the probation department to supervise appellant’s potential contact with those individuals. (CT 140; ARB at p. 7.)

associated with drugs.” (Appendix A, p. 10.)

The Court of Appeal relied on language contained in this Court’s decision in *People v. Olguin*, which held valid under *Lent* a probation condition requiring the probationer to inform the probation department of all pets living at his residence because it protected the safety of the officer when making unscheduled visits to the probationer’s home. (*Olguin, supra*, 45 Cal. 4th at pp. 380-381; Appendix A, pp. 9-10.)

The condition requiring notification of the presence of pets is reasonably related to future criminality because it serves to inform and protect a probation officer charged with supervising a probationer's compliance with specific conditions of probation. . . . [T]he protection of the probation officer while performing supervisory duties is reasonably related to the rehabilitation of a probationer for the purpose of deterring future criminality.

(*Olguin* at p. 381.) The *Olguin* court noted that the pet notification condition was “simple” and “imposed no undue hardship or burden.”

(*Olguin* at p. 382.) In this case the Court of Appeal reasoned that, under *Olguin*, it was “bound to accept the principle that conditions reasonably related to enhancing the effective supervision of a probationer are valid under *Lent*.” (Appendix A, p. 10.)

The court erred in applying the language in *Olguin*, which addressed only officer safety and potential distractions that would hamper probation searches, to extend to *any* probation condition that would aid the probation

department in supervising the probationer. Officer safety and protection is not an issue in this case, and no attempt has been made to justify the electronics search condition on those grounds. “Language used in any opinion is of course to be understood in the light of the facts and the issue then before the court, and an opinion is not authority for a proposition not therein considered.” (*Ginns v. Savage* (1964) 61 Cal.2d 520, 529, fn. 2.) This Court in *Olguin* did not contemplate or discuss the type of intrusive search condition challenged by Ricardo, and no published case has cited *Olguin* for the proposition that a probation condition whose only purpose is to enhance supervision of the probationer passes *Lent* muster.

The court’s reasoning essentially dispenses with the third prong of *Lent* altogether and would yield absurd results if implemented in future cases. If any probation condition that enhances supervision of the probationer is valid under *Lent*, almost any conceivable probation condition that provides information to the probation department about the probationer would be justified. For example, regular review of Ricardo’s private health records would provide information about his possible drug use, a body-mounted camera with a recording device would provide information about his movements and interactions with possible drug users, and interception of his mail and surveillance of his landline phone would provide information about his communications, wherein he may mention drug use. Indeed, constant, uninterrupted 24-hour surveillance of any juvenile

probationer, including his communications with family, friends, teachers, health providers, therapists, and employers would be valid under *Lent*, regardless of the circumstances of the minor's offense and background.

The court's extension of *Olguin* eviscerates *Lent* by broadening the test's third prong (reasonably related to future criminality) to include almost any conceivable probation condition under the justification that it would aid the probation officer in doing his or her job. This is especially alarming in the case of juveniles, who do not have the power to refuse probation. (*In re Tyrell J.* (1994) 8 Cal.4th 68, 82; *In re Erica R.* (2015) 240 Cal.App.4th 907, 914.)

Two recent cases from the First District Court of Appeal found the same probation condition invalid under *Lent* as not reasonably related to future criminal activity. In *In re Erica R.*, Division Two found the third prong of *Lent* satisfied because "there is nothing in Erica's past or current offenses or her personal history that demonstrates a predisposition to utilize electronic devices or social media in connection with criminal activity, there is no reason to believe the current restriction will serve the rehabilitative function of precluding Erica from any future criminal acts." [Citations]).) (*Erica R.*, *supra*, at p. 913; *In re D.G.* (2010) 187 Cal.App.4th 47, 53.) That court rejected the Attorney General's argument that the probation condition could be justified as assisting probation officers monitor compliance with other conditions: "not every probation condition

bearing a remote, attenuated, tangential, or diaphanous connection to future criminal conduct can be considered reasonable.” (*In re Erica R.*, *supra*, at p. 913, citing *In re Brandão* (2012) 210 Cal.App.4th. 568, 574.)

In re J.B. (November 25, 2015) 2015 WL 7567726, Division Three of the First District similarly found the probation condition invalid under the third prong of *Lent* and specifically declined to interpret *Olguin* as expansively as the Court of Appeal did in this case:

However, we question whether the Supreme Court decision in *People v. Olguin* (2008) 45 Cal.4th 375 justifies a probation condition that facilitates general supervision of a ward’s activities if the condition requires or forbids noncriminal conduct bearing no relation to the minor’s offense that is not reasonably related to potential future criminality as demonstrated by the minor’s history and prior misconduct. In our view, such a broad condition cannot be squared with the limitations imposed by *Lent*, *supra*, 15 Cal.3d at page 486, and in some cases may exceed constitutional limitations. (See *In re Sheena K.* (2007) 40 Cal.4th 875, 890.)

(*In re J.B.*, *supra*, 2015 WL 7567726 at *4.)

The Court of Appeal’s extension of *Olguin* to intrusive probation conditions wholly unrelated to officer safety renders the third prong of *Lent* meaningless and conflicts with other decisions from the same district. Appellant respectfully requests this Court grant review and strike the probation condition as impermissible under *Lent*.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons expressed above, review should be granted.

Dated: November 30, 2015

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Megan Hailey-Dunsheath
MEGAN HAILEY-DUNSHEATH
Attorney for Appellant,
Ricardo P.

CERTIFICATE OF COUNSEL

I certify that this brief contains 2510 words, excluding case caption, tables, and cover page.

Dated: November 30, 2015

/s/ Megan Hailey-Dunsheath
MEGAN HAILEY-DUNSHEATH
Attorney for Appellant
Ricardo P.

APPENDIX A

CERTIFIED FOR PUBLICATION

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

In re RICARDO P., a Person Coming
Under the Juvenile Court Law.

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

RICARDO P.,

Defendant and Appellant.

A144149

(Alameda County
Super. Ct. No. SJ14023676)

Ricardo P. appeals from a juvenile court order finding that he committed two felony counts of first degree burglary, declaring him to be a ward of the court, and placing him on probation. One of his probation conditions requires him to submit to warrantless searches of his “electronics including passwords.” He challenges this condition on the grounds that it (1) permits illegal eavesdropping under Penal Code section 632, (2) is not reasonable under *People v. Lent* (1975) 15 Cal.3d 481 (*Lent*), and (3) is unconstitutionally overbroad.¹

Several appeals are pending in this court that involve challenges to similar conditions imposed by the same Alameda County juvenile court.² And three other divisions recently issued opinions, two of which were published, addressing the legality

¹ All further statutory references are to the Penal Code unless otherwise noted.

² The cases of which we are aware are *In re J.R.* (A143163), *In re P.F.* (A143586), and *In re A.R.* (A144398).

of these types of conditions. In one of the published opinions, Division Two held that a probation condition requiring a juvenile to submit to warrantless searches of her “electronics” and provide her “passwords” to her probation officer was invalid under *Lent, supra*, 15 Cal.3d 481. (*In re Erica R.* (2015) 240 Cal.App.4th 907, 910-911 (*Erica R.*)) In the other published opinion, Division Three held that a probation condition requiring a juvenile to submit to warrantless searches of his “electronic devices” and provide “passwords” to those devices and social-media sites was unconstitutionally overbroad.³ (*In re Malik J.* (2015) 240 Cal.App.4th 896, 899-900 (*Malik J.*))

Although we employ different reasoning, we agree with our colleagues that a probation condition requiring, without limitation, a juvenile to submit to warrantless searches of electronic devices and accounts cannot be sustained. Although Ricardo’s condition does not run afoul of either section 632 or *Lent, supra*, 15 Cal.3d 481, it is overbroad because it infringes on his rights to privacy and expression without being sufficiently tailored. We therefore strike the condition and remand to the juvenile court for it to tailor a condition to Ricardo’s particular circumstances. We otherwise affirm the judgment.

I.
FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL
BACKGROUND

In February 2014, when he was almost 18 years old, Ricardo and two adults broke into two homes in San Jose.⁴ They were chased out of the first home before they could take anything. A few hours later, they stole costume jewelry from the second home, and all three were soon apprehended.

Several months later, the Santa Clara County District Attorney filed a petition under Welfare and Institutions Code section 602, subdivision (a) seeking to have Ricardo declared a ward of the court. The petition alleged two felony counts of first degree

³ Division Four issued the nonpublished decision on October 19, 2015.

⁴ The facts in this paragraph are drawn from an October 2014 probation report.

burglary.⁵ After Ricardo admitted the petition's allegations, the case was transferred to Alameda County for disposition.

At the dispositional hearing, the juvenile court declared Ricardo a ward of the court and placed him on probation with various conditions. These included conditions prohibiting him from using or possessing controlled substances, associating with people he "know[s] to use, deal[,] or possess illegal drugs," and having any contact with the two adult coparticipants in the burglaries. Additional conditions were imposed to facilitate monitoring of Ricardo's compliance with the terms of his probation. These included conditions requiring him to submit to drug testing and to "[s]ubmit person and any vehicle, room[,] or property, electronics including passwords under [his] control to search by Probation Officer or peace office[r] with or without a search warrant at any time of day or night."⁶ We shall refer to the portion of the latter condition permitting searches of "electronics including passwords" as the electronics search condition.⁷

Ricardo objected to the drug-related conditions on the basis there was no evidence he used drugs. In response, the juvenile court cited the following language from the dispositional report: "In regards to the present offense, the minor reported he wasn't thinking. He continued by saying that he stopped smoking marijuana after his arrest because he felt that [it] did not allow him to think clearly." When Ricardo then objected to the electronics search condition, the court responded, "I think the law is very clear that [such a condition] is appropriate[,] . . . particularly [for] minors or people that are [Ricardo's] age. I find that minors typically will brag about their marijuana usage or drug

⁵ Both allegations were made under sections 459 and 460, subdivision (a).

⁶ The quoted search-condition language appears in the amended minute order from the dispositional hearing. In its oral pronouncement, the juvenile court did not use the phrases "under [his] control" or "with or without a search warrant," but both appeared in the probation order that Ricardo signed. Under these circumstances, we conclude the written condition controls. (See *People v. Piralì* (2013) 217 Cal.App.4th 1341, 1346.)

⁷ The juvenile court apparently formulated on its own the phrase "electronics including passwords," as that language did not appear in the search condition proposed by the probation department in the dispositional report.

usage, particularly their marijuana usage, by posting on the Internet, showing pictures of themselves with paraphernalia, or smoking marijuana. It's a very important part of being able to monitor drug usage and particularly marijuana usage.”

II. DISCUSSION

A. *The Meaning of the Electronics Search Condition.*

Before discussing the merits of Ricardo's claims, we address how the electronics search condition should be construed.⁸ In interpreting a probation condition, we rely on “context and common sense” and give the condition “ ‘the meaning that would appear to a reasonable, objective reader.’ ” (*People v. Olguin* (2008) 45 Cal.4th 375, 382 (*Olguin*); *In re Ramon M.* (2009) 178 Cal.App.4th 665, 677.) We may also consider any of the juvenile court's “additional oral or written comments clarifying” the condition. (*In re Sheena K.* (2007) 40 Cal.4th 875, 891 (*Sheena K.*.)

The word “electronics” in the electronics search condition is most fittingly defined as “electronic devices.” (Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dict. (11th ed. 2003) p. 402; American Heritage Dict. (4th ed. 2000) p. 576; see *Wasatch Property Management v. Degrate* (2005) 35 Cal.4th 1111, 1121-1122 [courts may rely on dictionaries “to ascertain the ordinary, usual meaning of a word”].) The parties agree that the word covers “electronic devices,” and they agree that it should be construed to include both the physical device and the *data* contained on the device. This construction makes sense. If the term “electronics” did not include data, it would be redundant since Ricardo is separately required to submit to searches of his “property.” And the condition's reference to “passwords” further suggests the condition was intended to permit data searches.

The closer question is whether, as both parties contend, the electronics search condition encompasses not just data stored on electronic devices themselves but also electronic accounts, such as social-media accounts, that, while not stored on electronic devices, can be accessed through them. Had the juvenile court not explained why it was

⁸ We requested and received supplemental briefing on this issue from the parties.

imposing the condition, we would hesitate to agree that the condition includes such accounts. An account accessible through an electronic device, such as an account on a social-media site like Facebook, may be electronic but is not *an* “electronic.” And the inclusion of the word “passwords” is not determinative since, although electronic accounts generally have passwords, many electronic devices do as well (such as smartphones that are unlocked with a password).

Both parties, however, point to the juvenile court’s explanation that it intended the electronics search condition to permit monitoring of whether Ricardo was “brag[ging] about [his] marijuana usage or drug usage . . . by posting on the Internet, showing pictures of [himself] with paraphernalia, or smoking marijuana.” This explanation clarifies that the condition was meant to include at least electronic accounts through which a person can post information, including photographs, on the Internet. Thus, in evaluating Ricardo’s claims, we accept the parties’ interpretation of the condition to include both data stored on electronic devices and data in electronic accounts accessed through these devices.⁹

⁹ Although our interpretation comports with the understanding of the juvenile court and the parties, the electronics search condition is far from clear. We do not address in this opinion whether the condition is unconstitutionally vague, because Ricardo does not claim that it is. Still, as these types of conditions become increasingly common, courts and probation departments should take care to make them “ ‘sufficiently precise for the probationer to know what is required of him, and for the court to determine whether the condition has been violated.’ ” (*Sheena K.*, *supra*, 40 Cal.4th at p. 890; see also *In re E.O.* (2010) 188 Cal.App.4th 1149, 1153, 1157 [“probation conditions—particularly in juvenile cases—should be as comprehensible as possible”], italics omitted.) An example of a clearer condition is the one reviewed in *People v. Ebertowski* (2014) 228 Cal.App.4th 1170, which “required [the defendant] to (1) ‘provide all passwords to any electronic devices, including cell phones, computers, or notepads, within your custody or control, and submit such devices to search at any time without a warrant by any peace officer’ and (2) ‘provide all passwords to any social media sites, including Facebook, Instagram and Mocospace and to submit those sites to search at any time without a warrant by any peace officer.’ ” (*Id.* at p. 1172.)

B. Ricardo Lacks Standing to Pursue His Claim Under Section 632.

Section 632, subdivision (a) provides that “[e]very person who, intentionally and without the consent of all parties to a confidential communication, by means of any electronic amplifying or recording device, eavesdrops upon or records the confidential communication, whether the communication is carried on among the parties in the presence of one another or by means of a telegraph, telephone, or other device, except a radio,” is subject to a fine, incarceration, or both. Ricardo argues that the electronics search condition “must be stricken because it poses a risk of illegal eavesdropping” under section 632 in violation of the rights of anyone “with whom [he] communicates . . . [through] text and social media messaging” and that these people “may have claims under section 632” against the probation department. (Capitalization and boldface omitted.) The argument is unpersuasive.

To begin with, it appears that Ricardo forfeited the claim. Although the Attorney General does not raise the forfeiture issue, nothing in the record indicates that Ricardo argued below that the electronics search condition could give rise to illegal activity under section 632.

But even if we assume that Ricardo preserved the claim, we reject it because he lacks standing. His argument is that the electronics search condition might invade the privacy of the people with whom he communicates, not his own. “Courts are created to resolve cases and controversies and not to render advisory opinions or resolve questions of purely academic interest. Accordingly, courts will not consider issues tendered by a person whose rights and interests are not affected.” (*B. C. Cotton, Inc. v. Voss* (1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 929, 947-948.) Because the section 632 claim does not affect Ricardo’s rights and interests, we decline to consider it.

C. The Electronics Search Condition Is Reasonable Under Lent.

Ricardo next argues that the electronics search condition is invalid under *Lent*, *supra*, 15 Cal.3d 481. We disagree.

When a minor is made a ward of the juvenile court and placed on probation, the court “may impose and require any and all reasonable conditions that it may determine

fitting and proper to the end that justice may be done and the reformation and rehabilitation of the ward enhanced.” (Welf. & Inst. Code, § 730, subd. (b); see also *id.*, § 202, subd. (b).) “ ‘In fashioning the conditions of probation, the . . . court should consider the minor’s entire social history in addition to the circumstances of the crime.’ ” (*In re R.V.* (2009) 171 Cal.App.4th 239, 246.) The court has “broad discretion to fashion conditions of probation,” although “every juvenile probation condition must be made to fit the circumstances and the minor.” (*In re Josh W.* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1, 5; *In re Binh L.* (1992) 5 Cal.App.4th 194, 203.) We review the imposition of a probation condition for an abuse of discretion (*Olguin, supra*, 45 Cal.4th at p. 379), taking into account “the sentencing court’s stated purpose in imposing it.” (*People v. Fritchey* (1992) 2 Cal.App.4th 829, 837.)

Although a juvenile court’s discretion to impose probation conditions is broad, it has limits. (*In re D.G.* (2010) 187 Cal.App.4th 47, 52.) Under *Lent*, which applies to both juvenile and adult probationers, a condition is “invalid [if] it ‘(1) has no relationship to the crime of which the offender was convicted, (2) relates to conduct which is not in itself criminal, and (3) requires or forbids conduct which is not reasonably related to future criminality.’ ” (*Lent, supra*, 15 Cal.3d at p. 486; *In re Josh W., supra*, 55 Cal.App.4th at pp. 5-6.) “This test is conjunctive—all three prongs must be satisfied before a reviewing court will invalidate a probation term.” (*Olguin, supra*, 45 Cal.4th at p. 379.) We agree with *Erica R., supra*, 240 Cal.App.4th 907 that the first two prongs under *Lent* required to invalidate the type of electronics search condition imposed here are met. But unlike *Erica R.*, we conclude that the third prong is not met and the condition is therefore valid under *Lent*. We explain our analysis of each of *Lent*’s three prongs.

The first prong under *Lent, supra*, 15 Cal.3d 481 that must be met to invalidate a probation condition requires the condition to have no relationship to the offender’s crime. Ricardo argues the electronics search condition has no relationship to his crimes because there is no indication that he or the other perpetrators “used electronics or social media in connection with the burglaries.” In response, the Attorney General speculates that