

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ALEX RINCON,

Defendant and Appellant.

B285897

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. PA087225)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Cynthia L. Ulfig, Judge. Affirmed.

Lindsey M. Ball, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance by Plaintiff and Respondent.

* * * * *

Defendant Alex Rincon appeals following an order terminating his probation and imposing a previously suspended sentence.

Defendant pleaded no contest to possession for sale of methamphetamine. (Health & Saf. Code, § 11378.) Imposition of sentence was suspended and defendant was to serve formal probation for three years.

On three occasions, probation was revoked and a bench warrant issued, due to defendant's failure to report to probation. The first two times, probation was immediately reinstated upon defendant's appearance in court. Following the third revocation, the matter proceeded to a probation violation hearing. Defendant admitted the violation. The court terminated probation; imposed, but stayed execution of, the three-year high-term sentence; and reinstated probation.

Defendant again failed to report to probation. A probation violation hearing was held, where defendant conceded he had failed to report, but offered various explanations and excuses for his continued inability to comply. The court found defendant in violation, terminated probation, and executed the suspended sentence. Defendant appeals.

On June 28, 2018, defendant's appointed counsel filed a brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*). The brief included a declaration that counsel would write to

defendant, explaining the brief counsel was filing, and informing defendant of his right to file a supplemental brief. This court sent defendant a letter advising him that a *Wende* brief had been filed and that he had 30 days to submit a brief or letter raising any issues he wished us to consider. Defendant did not file a supplemental brief.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that defendant's attorney has fully complied with her responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

RUBIN, J.

WE CONCUR:

BIGELOW, P. J.

GRIMES, J.