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UNDER ARIZONA RULE OF THE SUPREME COURT 111(c), THIS DECISION IS NOT PRECEDENTIAL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 DAVID E.

No. 1 CA-JV 15-0393
FILED 4-19-2016

---

Appeal from the Superior Court in Yuma County
No. S1400JV20110196
The Honorable Kathryn E. Stocking-Tate, Judge *Pro Tempore*

**AFFIRMED**

---

COUNSEL

The Law Offices of Kelly A. Smith, Yuma
By Kelly A. Smith
*Counsel for Appellant*

Yuma County Attorney's Office, Yuma
By Nathaniel T. Sorenson
*Counsel for Appellee*

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

Judge Samuel A. Thumma delivered the decision of the Court, in which Presiding Judge Peter B. Swann and Judge Donn Kessler joined.

---

**T H U M M A**, Judge:

**¶1** This is an appeal under *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967) and *Maricopa County Juvenile Action No. JV-117258*, 163 Ariz. 484 (App. 1989). Counsel for appellant David E. has advised the court that, after searching the entire record, she has found no arguable question of law and asks this court to conduct an *Anders* review of the record. David E. was given the opportunity to file a supplemental brief pro se, but has not done so. This court has reviewed the record and has found no reversible error. Accordingly, David E.'s adjudication and resulting disposition are affirmed.

## FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY

**¶2** In August 2015, David E. was taken into custody by Yuma police and charged with misdemeanor shoplifting. At a continued advisory hearing in November 2015, David E. entered an admission, which was accepted after an appropriate colloquy. Without objection, the parties then proceeded to disposition at that same hearing without a written disposition report. David E. previously had been on standard probation for an unrelated offense. After hearing from the probation officer, the State and the juvenile, the court placed David E. on juvenile intensive probation until his eighteenth birthday, ordered counseling and imposed fees. From David E.'s timely appeal from his adjudication and disposition, this court has jurisdiction pursuant to Arizona revised Statutes (A.R.S.) sections 12-120.21(A)(1), 13-4031 and -4033 (2016).[1]

## DISCUSSION

**¶3** This court has reviewed and considered counsel's brief and has searched the entire record for reversible error. Searching the record and brief reveals no reversible error. The record shows David E. was represented by counsel at all relevant stages of the proceedings. The record shows that David E. knowingly, voluntarily and intentionally admitted the charge. From the record, all proceedings were conducted in compliance with the Arizona Rules of Procedure for Juvenile Court. The disposition imposed was authorized by statute.

[1] Absent material revisions after the relevant dates, statutes and rules cited refer to the current version unless otherwise indicated.

## CONCLUSION

**¶4** This court has read and considered counsel's brief and has searched the record provided for reversible error and has found none. *See JV-117258*, 163 Ariz. at 488. Accordingly, David E.'s adjudication and disposition are affirmed.

**¶5** Upon filing of this decision, counsel is directed to inform David E. of the status of his appeal and of his future options. Counsel has no further obligations unless, upon review, counsel identifies an issue appropriate for submission to the Arizona Supreme Court by petition for review. *See State v. Shattuck*, 140 Ariz. 582, 584–85 (1984). David E. shall have 30 days from the date of this decision to proceed, if he desires, with a pro se motion for reconsideration or petition for review.

