

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

---

IN RE P.B.-L.

No. 2 CA-JV 2014-0023  
Filed July 11, 2014

---

THIS DECISION DOES NOT CREATE LEGAL PRECEDENT AND  
MAY NOT BE CITED EXCEPT AS AUTHORIZED BY APPLICABLE RULES.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

*See* Ariz. R. Civ. App. P. 28(c); Ariz. R. P. Juv. Ct. 103(G).

---

Appeal from the Superior Court in Pima County  
No. JV20130291  
The Honorable Michael Butler, Judge

**AFFIRMED**

---

COUNSEL

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

IN RE P.B.-L.  
Decision of the Court

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

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

---

ESPINOSA, Judge:

¶1 The juvenile, seventeen-year-old P., appeals from the juvenile court's January 9, 2014, order committing him to the Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections (ADJC) until his eighteenth birthday. Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *In re Maricopa Cnty. Juv. Action No. JV-117258*, 163 Ariz. 484, 486-87, 788 P.2d 1235, 1237-38 (App. 1989), stating she has reviewed the record and that, based on that review, "[t]he only arguable issue which appears to exist in this delinquency appeal" is whether "the court abused its discretion in committing P., a first-time offender, to [ADJC]." She asks this court to review the record for fundamental error.

¶2 We find no reversible error. The record supports the juvenile court's findings that P.'s admission to the alleged offense of possession of marijuana for sale was knowing, voluntary, and intelligent and that he provided an adequate factual basis to support that admission. See A.R.S. § 13-3405(A)(2); Ariz. R. P. Juv. Ct. 32(D)(2).

¶3 The record also establishes the court appropriately exercised its discretion in committing the juvenile to ADJC. See A.R.S. § 8-341(A)(1)(e); *In re John G.*, 191 Ariz. 205, ¶ 8, 953 P.2d 1258, 1260 (App. 1998) ("We will not disturb a juvenile court's disposition order absent an abuse of discretion."). The court considered the nature of the offense, the lack of other appropriate less restrictive placement alternatives, and the rehabilitation opportunities available in ADJC, before concluding commitment was warranted. See Ariz. Code of Jud. Admin. § 6-304(C)(l).

IN RE P.B.-L.  
Decision of the Court

¶4 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have reviewed the record in its entirety and have found no fundamental or reversible error. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744. Accordingly, the juvenile court's order adjudicating P. delinquent and committing him to ADJC is affirmed.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>We note that the juvenile's eighteenth birthday has passed, arguably mooted any issue as to the disposition in this matter. But because we affirm the juvenile court's delinquency adjudication in the course of our review pursuant to *Anders* and because unforeseen consequences of the disposition could arise, we issue our decision in this matter despite P. having attained adulthood.