

¶12 His experienced 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, she finds no arguable ground for reversal. Counsel requested that we allow her client time to file a supplemental brief, but he did not take advantage of the opportunity. 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).

¶13 We have jurisdiction pursuant to Arizona Revised Statutes ("A.R.S.") section 8-235 (West 2012), and Arizona Rule of Procedure for the Juvenile Court 103. We review the facts "in the light most favorable to sustaining the adjudication." *In re John M.*, 201 Ariz. 424, 426, ¶ 7, 36 P.3d 772, 774 (App. 2001) (citation omitted). Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

FACTS AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

¶14 Jaciel was adjudicated delinquent for child molestation on May 25, 2010, despite his protests to the contrary. He was placed on probation in June 2010 and ordered to complete sex-offender treatment. The court, however,

reserved whether he would have to register as a sex offender for one year.

¶15 He was unsuccessfully discharged from the sex-offender treatment. He later admitted that he violated the terms and conditions of probation. As a result, he was sent to the Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections until his eighteenth birthday. Again, the court deferred the determination of registration as a sex offender.

¶16 The court held a hearing on January 5, 2012, to determine whether the juvenile had to register as a sex offender. After considering the evidence, the court ordered the youngster to register as a sex offender.

DISCUSSION

¶17 Jaciel argues that the court abused its discretion when he was ordered to register. He, however, was subject to the requirement at the time he was adjudicated delinquent pursuant to A.R.S. § 13-3821(A)(7) and (D) (West 2012).¹ Despite his continued assertion that he did not commit the offense, the registration order was within the discretion of the court based solely on the adjudicated offense. Consequently, we find no abuse of discretion.

¹ Unless revisions material to this decision have been made, we cite the current Westlaw version of the applicable statute. We also note that the registration requirement "shall terminate when the person reaches twenty-five years of age." A.R.S. § 13-3821(F).

CONCLUSION

¶18 We have read and considered the opening brief, and have searched the entire record for reversible error. See *JV-117258*, 163 Ariz. at 487-88, 788 P.2d at 1238-39. 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, Jaciel was represented by counsel at all stages of the proceedings, and the registration order was an appropriate consequence for the adjudicated offense.

¶19 After this decision has been filed, counsel's obligations in this appeal have ended. Counsel need only inform her client of the status of the appeal and his future options. *State v. Shattuck*, 140 Ariz. 582, 584-85, 684 P.2d 154, 156-57 (1984).

¶10 Accordingly, we affirm the registration order.

/s/

MAURICE PORTLEY, Presiding Judge

CONCURRING:

/s/

ANN A. SCOTT TIMMER, Judge

/s/

ANDREW W. GOULD, Judge