

IN THE
ARIZONA COURT OF APPEALS
DIVISION TWO

IN RE D.M.

No. 2 CA-JV 2020-0077
Filed September 25, 2020

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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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. JV20190652
The Honorable Ken Sanders, Judge Pro Tempore

AFFIRMED

COUNSEL

Sarah Michèle Martin, Tucson
Counsel for Minor

IN RE D.M.
Decision of the Court

MEMORANDUM DECISION

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

ECKERSTROM, Judge:

¶1 Pursuant to a plea agreement, fifteen-year-old D.M. admitted to committing criminal damage. The juvenile court adjudicated him delinquent and placed him on probation for twelve months. At a subsequent restitution hearing, the court ordered that D.M. pay \$20,000 in damages to the victim and its insurance company. He appealed the restitution order.

¶2 Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), stating she has “conscientiously reviewed the entire record on appeal and has been unable to find any arguable question of law that is not frivolous.” See *In re Maricopa Cty. Juv. Action No. JV-117258*, 163 Ariz. 484, 485-87 (App. 1989) (affording juveniles adjudicated delinquent *Anders*-type review on appeal). Consistent with *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 30 (App. 1999), counsel has provided “a detailed factual and procedural history of the case, with citations to the record,” and has asked us to search the record for reversible error.

¶3 Viewed in the light most favorable to upholding the juvenile court’s order, see *In re J.U.*, 241 Ariz. 156, ¶ 2 (App. 2016), the evidence presented at the restitution hearing supports the award of \$20,000 in damages to the victim and its insurance company. The court’s restitution order is consistent with the plea agreement and is statutorily authorized. See A.R.S. § 8-344(A); see also *In re William L.*, 211 Ariz. 236, ¶ 12 (App. 2005) (trial court has broad discretion in setting restitution based on facts of case).

¶4 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have searched the record for reversible error and have found none. Accordingly, we affirm the juvenile court’s restitution order.