

P O R T L E Y, Judge

¶1 Raylee H. ("Juvenile") appeals his adjudication and disposition. Juvenile's counsel has filed a brief in accordance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967), and *Maricopa County Juvenile Action No. JV-117258*, 163 Ariz. 484, 485-87, 788 P.2d 1235, 1236-38 (App. 1989), advising this court that after a search of the entire record on appeal, he finds no arguable ground for reversal. This court granted Juvenile an opportunity to file a supplemental brief, but he has not done so. Counsel now requests that we search the record for fundamental error. See *Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744; *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, 537, ¶ 30, 2 P.3d 89, 96 (App. 1999).

¶2 We have jurisdiction pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes ("A.R.S.") section 8-235 (2007), and Arizona Rule of Procedure for the Juvenile Court 103.

FACTS¹

¶3 Juvenile was adjudicated delinquent on May 20, 2009, and placed on probation on June 16, 2009. The State filed a delinquency petition charging him with violating his probation on June 26, 2009. While in custody at the Southeast Juvenile Detention Facility awaiting adjudication, Juvenile "punched" a detention officer "with a closed fist on [his] lower right lip" on

¹ We review the facts in the light most favorable to sustaining the adjudication. See *In re John M.*, 201 Ariz. 424, 426, ¶ 7, 36 P.3d 772, 774 (App. 2001).

July 2, 2009. He subsequently admitted to violating his probation pursuant to a plea agreement on July 15, 2009, and was awarded to the Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections ("ADJC").

¶4 The State filed a second delinquency petition on July 24, 2009, in connection with the assault on the detention officer. The juvenile court adjudicated Juvenile delinquent of aggravated assault, and re-awarded him to ADJC to serve a minimum of thirty days in a locked facility.

DISCUSSION

¶5 We have read and considered counsel's brief and have searched the entire record for reversible error. See *JV-117258*, 163 Ariz. at 488, 788 P.2d at 1239. We find none. All of the proceedings were conducted in compliance with the Arizona Rules of Procedure for the Juvenile Court. So far as the record reveals, Juvenile was represented by counsel at all stages of the proceedings, and the disposition imposed was within the statutory limits. See A.R.S. § 8-341 (Supp. 2009). Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

CONCLUSION

¶6 After the filing of this decision, counsel's obligations pertaining to Juvenile's representation in this appeal have ended. Counsel need do no more than inform him of the status of the appeal and his future options. See *State v. Shattuck*, 140 Ariz. 582, 584-85, 684 P.2d 154, 156-57 (1984).

¶7 Accordingly, we affirm the adjudication and disposition.

/s/

MAURICE PORTLEY, Presiding Judge

CONCURRING:

/s/

LAWRENCE F. WINTHROP, Judge

/s/

MARGARET H. DOWNIE, Judge