IN THE

ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS

DIVISION TWO

IN RE A.C.

No. 2 CA-JV 2015-0002
Filed April 29, 2015

THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.
NOT FOR PUBLICATION
See Ariz. R. Sup. Ct. 111(c)(1); Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 28(a)(1), (f);
Ariz. R. P. Juv. Ct. 103(G).

Appeal from the Superior Court in Pima County
No. JV20191401
The Honorable Richard E. Gordon, Judge

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Lori J. Lefferts, Pima County Public Defender
By Susan C. L. Kelly, Assistant Public Defender, Tucson
Counsel for Minor

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Judge Howard authored the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Kelly and Judge Vásquez concurred.

H O W A R D, Judge:

¶1 Pursuant to his admission of allegations set forth in a November 2014 delinquency petition and a petition to revoke the term of probation ordered in relation to an earlier delinquency proceeding, the juvenile court adjudicated sixteen-year-old A.C. delinquent of criminal damage/domestic violence and shoplifting, and found he had violated the terms of his probation based on his failure to attend school and report for a drug test. The court placed A.C. on probation for twelve months to be served as follows: standard probation at Sycamore Canyon Academy to be followed by juvenile intensive probation upon successful completion of the Sycamore Canyon program.

¶2 Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967). *See In re Maricopa Cnty. Juv. Action No. JV-117258*, 163 Ariz. 484, 486, 788 P.2d 1235, 1237 (App. 1989) (juveniles adjudicated delinquent have constitutional right to *Anders* appeal). Counsel states that, based on her review of the record, "[t]he only arguable issue which appears to exist in this delinquency appeal is whether the trial court abused its discretion in ordering out-of-home placement at Sycamore Canyon Academy."[1] She asks us to review the record for fundamental error.

¶3 Based on our review, we find no reversible error. *See State v. Thompson*, 229 Ariz. 43, ¶ 3, 270 P.3d 870, 872 (App. 2012).

---

[1] Counsel also contends, "a thorough review of the case appears to indicate that this is not a meritorious issue which can be argued in a formal appellate brief."

We view the evidence in the light most favorable to upholding the juvenile court's orders. *See In re John M.*, 201 Ariz. 424, ¶ 7, 36 P.3d 772, 774 (App. 2001). So viewed, we find no error in the court's conclusion that A.C. provided a factual basis to establish he had "put . . . dents" in the door of his father's home in July 2014; had "shoplifted" two cases of beer from a convenience store in October 2014; and had failed to attend school on eight dates and to participate in a drug test in October 2014,[2] in violation of the conditions of his probation. The court also found A.C.'s admissions were knowingly, voluntarily, and intelligently made.

¶4 This evidence is sufficient to support the juvenile court's findings of delinquency and that A.C. had violated the conditions of his probation. *See* A.R.S. §§ 8-341(B), 13-1601, 13-1602(A)(1), 13-1805(A). The record also establishes the court soundly exercised its broad discretion in determining the appropriate disposition. *See In re Themika M.*, 206 Ariz. 553, ¶ 5, 81 P.3d 344, 345 (App. 2003) (juvenile court has broad discretion to determine appropriate disposition of minor adjudicated delinquent and its determination will not be reversed absent abuse of discretion).

¶5 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have reviewed the record in its entirety. *See Thompson*, 229 Ariz. 43, ¶ 3, 270 P.3d at 872. We have found no arguable issue warranting further appellate review. *See id.* We therefore affirm the juvenile court's adjudication, revocation of probation, and disposition.

[2]At the trial review hearing, the juvenile court mistakenly stated A.C. had missed school in December rather than October 2014.