IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION ONE

IN RE JULIAN L.

No. 1 CA-JV 16-0489
FILED 6-15-2017

Appeal from the Superior Court in Maricopa County
No. JV200722
The Honorable Utiki Spurling Laing, Judge *Pro Tempore*

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Preciado Law Firm PLC, Phoenix
By Stephanie Preciado
Counsel for Appellant

Maricopa County Attorney's Office, Phoenix
By Diane Meloche
Counsel for Appellee

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Presiding Judge Peter B. Swann delivered the decision of the court, in which Judge Kent E. Cattani and Judge Donn Kessler joined.

S W A N N, Judge:

¶1 This is an appeal under *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *State v. Leon*, 104 Ariz. 297 (1969), from Julian L.'s (the "juvenile['s]") delinquency adjudication and disposition for possession of marijuana. We have reviewed the record for fundamental error. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. 738; *Smith v. Robbins*, 528 U.S. 259 (2000); *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530 (App. 1999); *In re Maricopa Cnty. Juv. Action No. JV-117258*, 163 Ariz. 484, 487 (App. 1989). Though we initially rejected counsel's request to allow the juvenile to file a supplemental brief, we later granted the motion. But the juvenile did not file a supplemental brief.

¶2 In March 2016, the juvenile was charged with one count of possession of marijuana and one count of possession of drug paraphernalia. Four months later, he was charged with theft of means of transportation. In September, he was charged with failure to stop on command and refusing to provide a driver's license on command. The juvenile entered a plea agreement under which he pled delinquent to possession of marijuana, a class six undesignated felony, which could be designated a misdemeanor upon successful completion of probation. The other charges were dismissed.

¶3 At the disposition hearing, the court noted that the juvenile was continuing to test positive for marijuana and cocaine, was not attending school, and was not complying with release conditions. In the exercise of its discretion under the plea agreement, the court ordered the juvenile detained for six days and imposed 45 days of deferred detention and eight weeks of deferred Juvenile Electronic Technological Surveillance. He was placed on standard probation beginning upon his release. The juvenile timely appeals.

¶4 We have reviewed the record and find no fundamental error. The court found that the juvenile knowingly, intelligently, and voluntarily entered into the plea agreement, and the punishment imposed is lawful.

See A.R.S. § 8-341(A)(1). The juvenile was present and represented by counsel at the critical stages.

¶5 Pursuant to *State v. Shattuck*, 140 Ariz. 582, 584–85 (1984), the juvenile's counsel's obligations in this appeal are at an end. Counsel need do no more than inform the juvenile of the status of the appeal and the juvenile's future options, unless counsel's review reveals an issue appropriate for submission to the Arizona Supreme Court by petition for review. *See* Ariz. R.P. Juv. Ct. 107(A); *see also* Ariz. R.P. Juv. Ct. 107(J).

AMY M. WOOD • Clerk of the Court
FILED: AA