

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

MARKEISE MATTHEWS,

Defendant and Appellant.

B246278

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. YA085700)

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

Richard B. Lennon, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Defendant, Markeise Matthews, appeals after he pled orally and in writing no contest to a single kidnapping count. (Pen. Code¹, § section 207, subd. (a).) Eight other felony counts were dismissed pursuant to the plea agreement. He was sentenced to prison for eight years with total presentence credits of 71 days and the following was also imposed: a \$240 section 1202.4, subdivision (b)(1) restitution fine; a section 1202.45, subdivision (a) \$240 parole restitution fine; a \$40 section 1465.8, subdivision (a)(1) court security fee; and a \$30 Government Code section 70373, subdivision (a)(1) criminal conviction assessment.

The probation report indicates that on September 26, 2012, defendant accosted a 17-year-old victim in a doctor's office, forced her into a car and drove her away. On another occasion, October 8, 2012, he threatened to kill the victim and her family. After school on October 8, 2012, once again, he accosted the victim and forced her into a car driving her away against her will. On this occasion, defendant used a knife. On October 9, 2012, defendant threatened the victim with a knife. The victim then finally notified the police.

We appointed counsel to represent defendant. After examination of the record, appellate counsel has filed a brief in which no issues are raised. Instead, appointed counsel has asked us to independently review the entire record on appeal pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441-442. (See *Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 264.) We advised defendant he had 30 days within which to submit by brief or letter any contentions or argument he wished us to consider. No response has been received. We have examined the entire record in accordance with *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at pages 441-442. Neither appointed counsel nor defendant has identified any issue for our review. We agree with appointed appellate counsel that no arguable issue exists on appeal.

¹ Unless otherwise noted, all future statutory references are to the Penal Code.

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

TURNER, P. J.

We concur:

MOSK, J.

KUMAR, J.*

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