

NOTICE: THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND MAY NOT BE CITED
EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.
See Ariz. R. Supreme Court 111(c); ARCAP 28(c);
Ariz. R. Crim. P. 31.24



DIVISION ONE
FILED: 05-25-2010
PHILIP G. URRY, CLERK
BY: GH

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
STATE OF ARIZONA
DIVISION ONE

IN RE DEANNA F.) 1 CA-JV 10-0077
)
) DEPARTMENT B
)
) **MEMORANDUM DECISION**
) (Not for Publication -
) Ariz. R.P. Juv. Ct. 103(G);
) ARCAP 28)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Appeal from the Superior Court in Maricopa County

Cause No. JV178174

The Honorable Aimee L. Anderson, Judge

AFFIRMED

Richard M. Romley, Maricopa County Attorney Phoenix
By Jeffrey W. Trudgian, Appeals Bureau Chief/
Deputy County Attorney
Attorneys for Appellee

James J. Haas, Maricopa County Public Defender Phoenix
By Suzanne Sanchez, Deputy Public Defender Mesa
Attorneys for Appellant

P O R T L E Y, Judge

¶1 Deanna F. ("Juvenile") appeals her 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, she finds no arguable ground for reversal. Counsel 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).

¶12 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

¶13 Juvenile was adjudicated delinquent of theft and false reporting to law enforcement agency on October 15, 2009, both misdemeanors, and placed on standard probation. The State filed a delinquency petition on February 2, 2010, charging Juvenile with violating her probation by running away from home and failing to notify her probation officer of her new residence. Following an adjudication hearing, the court found that Juvenile had violated her probation, and committed her to the Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections ("ADJC") for institutional

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).

placement until the age of eighteen or until released earlier pursuant to law.

DISCUSSION

¶4 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.² See A.R.S. § 8-341 (Supp. 2009). Finding no reversible error, we affirm.

² In her brief, counsel indicated that Juvenile "proposes that this court determine whether the superior court abused its discretion when it committed her to ADJC." A.R.S. § 8-341(A)(1)(e) specifically authorizes a juvenile court to commit a juvenile delinquent to the care and custody of ADJC, and the court has broad discretion to determine the appropriate disposition. *In re Miguel R.*, 204 Ariz. 328, 331, ¶ 3, 63 P.3d 1065, 1068 (App. 2003). In exercising its discretion, the juvenile court is required to consider the guidelines for commitment promulgated by the Arizona Supreme Court. See A.R.S. § 8-246(C) (2007); Ariz. Code of Jud. Admin. § 6-304(C). Here, the juvenile court explicitly considered the guidelines, and, after exploring Juvenile's history of noncompliance with alternative forms of treatment, determined that commitment to ADJC "[was] the only option available to the Court . . . for the rehabilitation of the juvenile as well as the protection of the community." Consequently, the court did not abuse its discretion when it committed Juvenile to ADJC.

CONCLUSION

¶15 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 her of the status of the appeal and her future options. See *State v. Shattuck*, 140 Ariz. 582, 584-85, 684 P.2d 154, 156-57 (1984).

¶16 Accordingly, we affirm the adjudication and disposition.

/s/

MAURICE PORTLEY, Judge

CONCURRING:

/s/

JOHN C. GEMMILL, Presiding Judge

/s/

PATRICIA K. NORRIS, Judge