

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

---

IN RE H.E.

No. 2 CA-JV 2015-0081  
Filed July 23, 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NOT FOR PUBLICATION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. JV20140268  
The Honorable Richard E. Gordon, Judge

**AFFIRMED**

---

COUNSEL

Nuccio & Shirly, P.C., Tucson  
By Jeanne Shirly  
*Counsel for Minor*

IN RE H.E.  
Decision of the Court

---

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

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

---

M I L L E R, Presiding Judge:

¶1 Seventeen-year-old H.E. appeals from the juvenile court's April 2015 order adjudicating him delinquent for aggravated assault on a police officer and placing him on probation. Counsel has filed a brief in compliance with *Anders v. California*, 386 U.S. 738 (1967), and *In re Maricopa County Juvenile Action No. JV-117258*, 163 Ariz. 484, 486-87, 788 P.2d 1235, 1237-38 (App. 1989), avowing she has reviewed the record and found no arguable issues to raise on appeal. In compliance with *State v. Clark*, 196 Ariz. 530, ¶ 32, 2 P.3d 89, 97 (App. 1999), counsel has provided "a detailed factual and procedural history of the case with citations to the record, [so] this court can satisfy itself that counsel has in fact thoroughly reviewed the record."

¶2 Pursuant to our obligation under *Anders*, we have reviewed the record in its entirety and are satisfied it supports counsel's recitation of the facts. Viewed 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), the evidence shows that H.E. was one of five teenaged boys detained by police officers during their investigation of a fight; while in handcuffs, he struggled to his feet and kicked one of the uniformed officers in the shin, causing him pain and bruising.

¶3 Substantial evidence thus supported the juvenile court's finding that H.E. was responsible for an assault knowingly committed upon a peace officer, an aggravated assault pursuant to A.R.S. §§ 13-1203(A)(1) and 13-1204(A)(8)(a), and the court's disposition was statutorily authorized, *see* A.R.S. § 8-341(A)(1)(a). We have found no fundamental error, no reversible error, and no

IN RE H.E.  
Decision of the Court

arguable issue warranting further appellate review. *See Anders*, 386 U.S. at 744. Accordingly, the court's adjudication and disposition orders are affirmed.