

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

MAGED L. KARAS,

Defendant and Appellant.

B278112

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. A084533)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Leslie E. Brown, Judge. Affirmed.

Stephen Borgo, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

## INTRODUCTION

Defendant and appellant Maged L. Karas filed an application seeking to have a felony conviction be designated a misdemeanor conviction under Proposition 47. (Pen. Code, § 1170.18<sup>1</sup>.) In his application, defendant contended he was convicted on September 27, 1982, of violating section 211 (robbery).<sup>2</sup> The trial court denied the application, ruling a conviction for violating section 211 does not qualify for relief under Proposition 47.

On appeal, defendant's appointed counsel filed an opening brief in accordance with *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, requesting this court to conduct an independent review of the record to determine if there are any arguable issues on appeal. On February 9, 2017, we gave notice to defendant that counsel had failed to find any arguable issues, and defendant had 30 days within which to submit by brief or letter any grounds of appeal, contentions, or arguments he wished this court to consider. Defendant did not file a brief or letter. We affirm.

---

<sup>1</sup> All statutory citations are to the Penal Code.

<sup>2</sup> Actually, on May 7, 1982, defendant pleaded guilty to three violations of section 211.

### DISCUSSION<sup>3</sup>

The trial court properly denied defendant's application under Proposition 47. Defendant pleaded guilty to three violations of section 211, offenses not eligible for Proposition 47 resentencing. (§ 1170.18, subd. (b).)

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied defendant's counsel has fully complied with his responsibilities and no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 441.) Accordingly, we affirm the order.

---

<sup>3</sup> We omit a recitation of the facts concerning defendant's underlying convictions as they were based on guilty pleas.

**DISPOSITION**

The order is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS.

DUNNING, J.\*

We concur:

KRIEGLER, Acting P. J.

BAKER, J.

---

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