

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JASMINE CHASTITY MIMS,

Defendant and Appellant.

B235668

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. MA043907)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Kathleen Blanchard, Judge. Affirmed.

Jonathan B. Steiner and Elizabeth A. Courtenay, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

On October 14, 2008, Natasha King was at the home of defendant's sister, Shynette Montgomery, in Palmdale. At approximately 4:15 p.m., defendant came to the door and began to yell at Montgomery. King and defendant exchanged fisticuffs, and Montgomery broke up the fight. King believed defendant had left, but defendant returned with a bicycle chain with a lock on the end, and hit King on the head. King suffered from lacerations and as a result, had scars on her head.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On January 8, 2009, the court issued a protective order for King and bound defendant for trial. On January 13, 2009, defendant was charged with one count of assault with a deadly weapon (Pen. Code, § 245, subd. (a)(1)). Defendant was released on \$30,000 bail.

On September 21, 2009, defendant appeared in court for a hearing on a possible violation of the protective order. At the hearing, King testified that defendant had come to her house three separate times and made threats to King's brother, Vincent King, who lived with King and who was defendant's boyfriend. Defendant on one occasion tried to pry off the screen door of King's apartment. The court preliminarily found defendant in violation of the protective order, exonerated defendant's bail, reset bail at \$250,000, and trailed the matter to the next day.

On September 22, 2009, King testified that in May 2009, defendant texted her three derogatory messages. Further, Vincent King sometimes stayed with King at her apartment, and defendant left a threatening text message on Vincent King's phone. However, Vincent King testified that he was the one who sent the text messages to his sister, and that his nephew damaged the screen door at King's apartment. Vincent King was currently living with defendant. Defendant denied going to King's apartment and denied calling King.

The court found defendant in violation of the protective order, and remanded defendant to custody.

The same day, defendant entered a plea of no contest to one count of assault with a deadly weapon in violation of Penal Code section 245, subdivision (a)(1). The court sentenced defendant to four years, suspended execution of her sentence, and placed her on probation for three years. The court also ordered as conditions of defendant's probation that she attend three months of anger management classes, pay restitution and fines, perform 45 days of CALTRANS service, and obey the protective order. The court further prohibited defendant from owning, using, or threatening any person with deadly weapons, or from threatening to use force or using violence against any person, and entered a new protective order with a term of three years to coincide with defendant's probation. After taking defendant's waivers, the court found a factual basis for defendant's plea and found defendant guilty.

On June 22, 2011, after a probation search, defendant was arrested as being in violation of probation because a search of the residence where defendant was living yielded a loaded Glock .40-caliber firearm in the bedroom. Defendant was remanded to custody.

On July 12, 2011, the court advised defendant that the court was prepared to terminate probation and impose sentence because defendant had violated the terms of her probation by having a weapon, failing to attend anger management, and failing to perform CALTRANS service. In exchange for admission of her probation violations, the court revoked and reinstated defendant's probation with the same terms and conditions, and in addition ordered her to serve 90 days in jail and perform an additional 15 days of CALTRANS work.

Defendant's request for a certificate of probable cause was denied.

We appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues and asking this court to independently review the record. On February 22, 2012, we advised defendant she had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues she wished us to consider. To date, we have received no response. We have examined the entire record

and are satisfied that defendant's attorneys have fully complied with their responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 109–110; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

JOHNSON, J.

We concur:

MALLANO, P. J.

ROTHSCHILD, J.