

NOTICE: NOT FOR OFFICIAL PUBLICATION.  
UNDER ARIZONA RULE OF THE SUPREME COURT 111(c), THIS DECISION IS NOT PRECEDENTIAL  
AND MAY BE CITED ONLY AS AUTHORIZED BY RULE.

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

---

IN RE ANGELINA C.

No. 1 CA-JV 22-0024  
FILED 7-21-2022

---

Appeal from the Superior Court in Maricopa County  
No. JV604992  
The Honorable Janice K. Crawford, Judge

**AFFIRMED**

---

COUNSEL

Maricopa County Public Advocate, Mesa  
By Colleen Engineer  
*Counsel for Appellant*

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

Vice Chief Judge David B. Gass delivered the decision of the court, in which  
Presiding Judge Paul J. McMurdie and Judge Angela K. Paton joined.

---

IN RE ANGELINA C.  
Decision of the Court

**G A S S**, Vice Chief Judge:

¶1 Angelina C. filed this appeal in accordance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), *State v. Leon*, 104 Ariz. 297 (1969), and *Maricopa Cnty. Juv. Action No. JV-117258*, 163 Ariz. 484 (App. 1989). Angelina’s counsel searched the record and identified no arguable, non-frivolous question of law. Counsel, therefore, asks this court to review the record for fundamental error. Finding no error in the record, we affirm.

**FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

¶2 This court views the facts in the light most favorable to sustaining the superior court’s order adjudicating a minor delinquent. *See In re Natalie Z.*, 214 Ariz. 452, 454, ¶ 2 (App. 2007).

¶3 Angelina has autism spectrum, sensory, detachment, and bipolar disorders. In February, Angelina – then 15-years old – was a patient at Oasis Behavioral Health Center. When a health worker asked Angelina to go to the bathroom, she refused and spat in the worker’s face. As other health workers tried to restrain Angelina, she hit the worker in the face – leaving scratch marks – and pulled clumps of hair from the worker’s head.

¶4 In April, while detained at the Durango Juvenile Detention Center, Angelina became upset because she would not return home to celebrate Easter. During an escort, she tried to scratch a detention officer. Another detention officer placed Angelina’s hands behind her back and Angelina spat onto that officer’s hair, face, and shirt.

¶5 In May, Angelina was released from detention. Later that month, while Angelina was staying at her family’s home, she became upset when her mother told her she could not visit family in Tucson. Angelina hit her mother and also threw and broke household items – including her brother’s hot wheels playset, a plate, detergent, a toy car, and numerous other toys. She also damaged a dresser and held a pair of scissors to her own stomach and threatened to hurt herself.

¶6 The following week, Angelina became upset when her mother asked her to do chores. She attacked her mother, punching her several times and throwing household items. When officers arrived, Angelina repeated several suicidal statements, so the officers transported her to a hospital. At the hospital, Angelina began screaming and nurses tried to restrain her. Angelina spat at one nurse and scratched another nurse on the arm. Angelina also scratched a police officer who was trying to help the nurses restrain her.

IN RE ANGELINA C.  
Decision of the Court

¶7 Two days later, while she was still at the hospital, Angelina threw a phone at one nurse and spat on another nurse. In July, Angelina asked to return to Oasis. But when she arrived, she had another episode during which she screamed, shook, hit herself, pulled her hair, and clawed at her mother's face.

¶8 In successive delinquency petitions, the State charged numerous counts against Angelina, including assault by a prisoner with bodily fluids, aggravated assault against medical staff, aggravated assault against a peace officer, two counts of domestic-violence assault, domestic-violence threat or intimidation, disorderly conduct, and criminal damage. At the change of plea hearing, Angelina pled to assault by a prisoner with bodily fluid (reduced to a class 1 misdemeanor), attempted aggravated assault against a peace officer (a class 6 designated felony), and aggravated assault against a healthcare worker (reduced to a class 1 misdemeanor). The superior court dismissed the remaining charges.

¶9 The superior court ordered Angelina to be committed to the Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections (ADJC) for a minimum of 30 days. Angelina timely appealed. This court has jurisdiction under Article VI, Section 9, of the Arizona Constitution, and A.R.S. §§ 12-120.21.A.1 and 8-235.A.

ANALYSIS

¶10 We have read and considered counsel's brief and fully reviewed the record for reversible error, finding none. *See Leon*, 104 Ariz. at 300; *JV-117258*, 163 Ariz. at 486.

¶11 The record shows Angelina knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently admitted the charges against her. *See Ariz. R.P. Juv. Ct. 220(c)(1)*. Her admissions supported the superior court's adjudication, and she provided an adequate factual basis to support those admissions. *See A.R.S. §§ 13-1212.A, -1001.A, -1203.A.3, -1204.A.8(a), (e); Ariz. R.P. Juv. Ct. 220(c)(3)*. All the proceedings were conducted according to the Rules of Procedure for the Juvenile Court. The record shows Angelina was present for, and represented by counsel at, all critical stages of the proceedings. *See A.R.S. §§ 8-307.A, -221.A; Ariz. R.P. Juv. Ct. 208(a), 206(a)-(b); see also Ariz. R.P. Juv. Ct. 208(b)* (a virtual appearance is considered a personal appearance). She was also given the opportunity to speak at her disposition hearing. Sufficient evidence supports the adjudication and the superior court imposed a disposition within its discretion. *See A.R.S. § 8-341.A.1(e); see also In re Miguel R.*, 204 Ariz. 328, 332, ¶ 9 (App. 2003).

IN RE ANGELINA C.  
Decision of the Court

¶12 Angelina argues the superior court abused its discretion by committing her to ADJC rather than a residential facility. The superior court has broad discretion in determining the appropriate disposition for delinquent juveniles. *See In re Niky R.*, 203 Ariz. 387, 392, ¶ 21 (App. 2002). This court “will not disturb a [superior] court’s disposition order absent an abuse of discretion.” *In re John G.*, 191 Ariz. 205, 207, ¶ 8 (App. 1998).

¶13 Given Angelina’s extensive history of violent acts against herself, her family, health-care workers, and others, the superior court found committing her to ADJC was the only option “to keep the public safe, keep Angelina safe, and provide her the treatment that she needs.” The superior court’s findings demonstrate it considered the factors required to commit a juvenile to ADJC, including protecting the community, rehabilitating the juvenile, the nature of her offenses, and less restrictive alternatives. *See* Ariz. Code of Jud. Admin. § 6-304.C.1.a-d. At Angelina’s request, the superior deferred the disposition hearing until they could place her in a residential behavioral facility. But because of Angelina’s history, all available placements denied her. Accordingly, the superior court appropriately exercised its discretion when it committed Angelina to ADJC. *See* A.R.S. § 8-341.A.1(e), -246.B.2; Ariz. Code of Jud. Admin. § 6-304; *In re John G.*, 191 Ariz. at 207, ¶ 8.

CONCLUSION

¶14 We affirm Angelina’s convictions and sentence.

¶15 Defense counsel’s obligations pertaining to Angelina’s representation in this appeal have ended. Defense counsel need do no more than inform Angelina of the outcome of this appeal and her future options, unless, upon review, counsel finds an issue appropriate for submission to our supreme court by petition for review. *See State v. Shattuck*, 140 Ariz. 582, 584-85 (1984); Ariz. R.P. Juv. Ct. 609(b).



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