

IN THE  
**ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS**  
DIVISION TWO

---

IN RE G.Y.

No. 2 CA-JV 2013-0139  
Filed March 19, 2014

---

THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND  
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.  
NOT FOR PUBLICATION  
*See Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 28(c); Ariz. R. P. Juv. Ct. 103(G).*

---

Appeal from the Superior Court in Greenlee County  
No. JV201300013  
The Honorable Monica L. Stauffer, Judge

**AFFIRMED**

---

COUNSEL

Derek D. Rapier, Greenlee County Attorney  
By Donielle Wright, Deputy County Attorney, Clifton  
*Counsel for State*

Law Office of Stephen K. Lundell, PLC, Tucson  
By Stephen K. Lundell  
*Counsel for Minor*

IN RE G.Y.  
Decision of the Court

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

Presiding Judge Kelly authored the decision of the Court, in which Judge Espinosa and Judge Eckerstrom concurred.

---

K E L L Y, Presiding Judge:

¶1 G.Y. was charged by delinquency petition with two counts of criminal damage, both misdemeanors, and one count of being an incorrigible child. After he admitted to one count of criminal damage and the incorrigibility charge, the juvenile court adjudicated G.Y. delinquent and committed him to the Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections (ADJC) for a minimum period of thirty days and, at most, until his eighteenth birthday. G.Y. appealed but appointed counsel subsequently filed a motion to dismiss the appeal, avowing he had found “no error in the adjudication proceedings or in the disposition of the case.”

¶2 Because delinquency proceedings are quasi-criminal in nature, *see In re Cochise Cnty. Juv. Action No. JV95000239*, 186 Ariz. 234, 236 n.1, 921 P.2d 34, 36 n.1 (App. 1996), and because *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), applies to appeals in delinquency proceedings, *see In re Maricopa Cnty. Juv. Action No. JV-117258*, 163 Ariz. 484, 486, 788 P.2d 1235, 1237 (App. 1989), this court denied the motion to dismiss the appeal. Instead, the matter was submitted for a review pursuant to *Anders*. We have examined the record before us for reversible error, *see State v. Thompson*, 229 Ariz. 43, ¶ 3, 270 P.3d 870, 872 (App. 2012), and have found no error that can be so characterized.

¶3 G.Y.’s admissions were supported by an adequate factual basis and the juvenile court accepted them after reviewing with G.Y. the constitutional rights he was waiving by admitting responsibility. G.Y. admitted he had stabbed the tire of the victim’s car, thereby violating A.R.S. § 13-1602(A)(1), and that he was truant regularly and was, therefore, an incorrigible child. *See* A.R.S. §§ 8-201(16)(b), 15-803(C). Similarly, we find no error with respect to the

IN RE G.Y.  
Decision of the Court

disposition; the record shows the court considered all of the relevant information, including the information contained in the pre-dispositional report and the applicable commitment guidelines.

¶4 The juvenile court's orders adjudicating G.Y. delinquent and committing him to ADJC are affirmed.