

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ADRIAN SALCEDO,

Defendant and Appellant.

B280284

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. 6PH08722)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Jacqueline H. Lewis, Judge. Affirmed.

Heather E. Shallenberger, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

---

In this *Wende*<sup>1</sup> appeal, defendant Adrian Salcedo challenges the order revoking and reinstating parole. The order is affirmed.

While on supervised parole,<sup>2</sup> defendant was arrested for domestic violence (spousal battery) on September 6, 2016. As a result of that arrest, the Division of Adult Parole Operations filed a petition for revocation of parole, alleging that defendant violated the terms and conditions of parole when he committed spousal battery. (Pen. Code, §§ 3000.08, 1203.2.) The matter was set for a combined probable cause and parole revocation hearing.

At the January 3, 2017 hearing, the trial court received documentary and photographic evidence of the spousal battery committed by defendant in September 2016. Defense counsel stipulated that defendant “was convicted of a misdemeanor on December 20th, 2016 in case number 6EM0087” for violation of Penal Code section “243(e)” (spousal battery). Defendant personally addressed the court and stated that he did not strike his wife. However, the court found the victim’s statements were corroborated by the photographs of her injuries as well as the statements of an adult daughter. The court sustained the petition. It issued an order revoking and restoring parole, subject to completion of jail sanctions, on the same terms and conditions plus additional enumerated conditions including completion of a certified 52-week batterer’s program and compliance with a stay away order. The jail sanctions consisted of 180 days in county

---

<sup>1</sup> *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.

<sup>2</sup> Defendant was convicted of second degree robbery in February 2014.

jail, with 32 days of credit (16 actual days and 16 goodtime/worktime days).

Defendant filed a timely notice of appeal from the January 3, 2017 order. After his attorney filed a *Wende* brief that raised no potentially arguable issues, defendant was notified of his right to submit a supplemental brief or letter regarding any additional grounds that he wished this court to consider. We have received no communication from him.

Based on our independent analysis of counsel's brief and the entire appellate record, we find there is no arguable issue on appeal. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 121; *People v. Kent* (2014) 229 Cal.App.4th 293, 300.)

#### **DISPOSITION**

The order is affirmed.

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

EPSTEIN, P. J.

We concur:

WILLHITE, J.

MANELLA, J.