

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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 TWO

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

STEVEN MARTIN SANCHEZ, JR.,

Defendant and Appellant.

B288410

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. BA448521)

THE COURT:

On October 16, 2017, the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office filed an amended information charging defendant and appellant Steven Martin Sanchez, Jr., with one count of battery with serious bodily injury against David Dawson (Dawson). (Pen. Code, § 243, subd. (d).) A second count charged defendant with assault by means of force likely to produce great bodily injury. (Pen. Code, § 245, subd. (a)(4).)

Over defendant's objection, a great bodily injury enhancement was attached to both counts after the preliminary hearing. (Pen. Code, § 12022.7, subd. (a).)

At trial, the trial court did not allow some impeachment of Dawson and limited the scope of the testimony of a defense witness. 9-1-1 calls were played over defense counsel's objection.

The jury found defendant guilty of count one and the corresponding special allegation true. It acquitted defendant of count two.

At the probation and sentencing proceedings, the trial court sentenced defendant to the mid-term of three years in state prison, but suspended execution of the sentence. It placed defendant on five years' of formal probation and ordered him to serve 36 days in county jail, perform 30 days of community labor, complete six months of anger management counseling, and pay various fines and fees, and restitution to Dawson. He was given 30 days of actual credit and additional 6 days of good time credit.

Defendant's timely appeal ensued.

Counsel was appointed to represent defendant in connection with this appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an "Opening Brief" in which no arguable issues were raised. On August 17, 2018, we advised defendant that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues for us to consider. No response has been received to date.

We have examined the entire record and we are satisfied that defendant's appellate counsel has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441 (*Wende*).) We see no indication of any error by the trial court.

Defendant has, by virtue of counsel's compliance with the *Wende* procedure and our review of the record, received adequate and effective appellate review of the judgment and sentence entered against him in this case. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 278; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 123–124.)

The trial court's judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS.

LUI, P.J.

ASHMANN-GERST, J.

CHAVEZ, J.