

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

IVAN FABIAN HARO,

Defendant and Appellant.

B298400

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. SA099614)

THE COURT:*

Ivan Fabian Haro (defendant) appeals his conviction of second degree robbery. His appointed counsel filed a brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*), raising no issues. On September 24, 2019, we notified defendant of his counsel's brief and gave him leave to file, within 30 days, his own brief or letter stating any grounds or argument he might wish to have considered. That time has elapsed, and defendant has submitted no brief or letter. We have reviewed the entire record, and finding no arguable issues, affirm the judgment.

The prosecution evidence established that on the afternoon of December 18, 2018, Kensuke Hirota (Hirota) and his seven-year-old son were sitting in a car which was parked across the street from the child's elementary school. Defendant approached the car, opened the front passenger door, reached in, and grabbed Hirota's bag which contained various documents including the family's passports and Hirota's driver's license. Hirota attempted to retrieve the bag but backed off when defendant raised his fists. Defendant fled the scene on a bicycle. Defendant was arrested the following day for an unrelated trespass. He was in possession of a backpack containing Hirota's driver's license, and a search of his pockets yielded further documents belonging to the Hirota family. Hirota selected defendant's photograph from a six-pack and identified him again at trial.

The jury found defendant guilty of second degree robbery in violation of Penal Code section 211. The trial court sentenced defendant to the midterm of three years in state prison. Defendant filed a timely notice of appeal from the judgment.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that defendant's attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. We conclude that 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 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 judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS.

*ASHMANN-GERST, Acting P.J., CHAVEZ, J., HOFFSTADT, J.