

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FIVE

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

URIEL GONZALEZ,

Defendant and Appellant.

B243066

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. PA038714)

APPEAL from orders of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Daniel B. Feldstern, Judge. Dismissed.

Richard B. Lennon, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance on behalf of Plaintiff and Respondent.

Defendant, Uriel Gonzalez, purports to appeal from July 20, 2012 post-judgment orders denying his motion to vacate sentence and habeas corpus petition. The August 1, 2012 orders do not appear to be appealable. We have a duty to raise issues concerning our jurisdiction on our own motion. (*Jennings v. Marralle* (1994) 8 Cal.4th 121, 126; *Olson v. Cory* (1983) 35 Cal.3d 390, 398.) We issued an order to show cause and calendared the matter for oral argument.

The post-judgment motion argued that defendant did not receive the effective assistance of counsel in connection with the removal of a spectator. The July 20, 2012 post-judgment order is not appealable on that ground. (*People v. Cantrell* (1961) 197 Cal.App.2d 40, 43; *People v. Bowles* (1933) 135 Cal.App. 514, 516; see *People v. Thomas* (1959) 52 Cal.2d 521, 527; 6 Witkin & Epstein, Cal. Criminal Law (4th ed. 2012) “Criminal Appeals,” § 65, pp. 341-342.) Further, insofar as the July 20, 2012 post-judgment order may be construed as one denying a habeas corpus petition, it is not appealable. (*In re Clark* (1993) 5 Cal.4th 750, 767, fn. 7; *In re Hochberg* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 870, 876, disapproved on other grounds in *In re Fields* (1990) 51 Cal.3d 1063, 1070, fn. 3.) We have considered the views expressed in defendant’s pro se filing. They have no merit.

The appeal is dismissed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

TURNER, P. J.

We concur:

KRIEGLER, J.

FERNS, J.*

* Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.