

Filed 4/20/18 P. v. Cook CA2/5

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

MOAMMAR AMEEN COOK,

Defendant and Appellant.

B284047

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. TA142692)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Allen J. Webster, Jr., Judge. Affirmed.

David Cohen, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

In June 2017, the Los Angeles County District Attorney charged defendant Moammar Ameen Cook (defendant) in a six-count amended information with injuring a spouse, cohabitant, or girlfriend (count 1), assault with a deadly weapon (count 2), two counts of assault by means of force likely to produce great bodily injury (counts 4 and 5¹), dissuading a witness from prosecuting a crime (count 6), and second degree robbery (count 7). The charges were predicated on evidence defendant physically abused his then-girlfriend on two occasions, including one instance in which he took her phone and drove with her on the hood of his car before stopping abruptly and causing her to fall.

The jury convicted defendant of simple assault (a lesser included offense of count 4) and petty theft (a lesser included offense of count 7) and acquitted him of all other counts. The court sentenced defendant to three years' summary probation for the two misdemeanor convictions, with a condition that he serve 113 days in county jail. The court additionally ordered defendant to stay away from his ex-girlfriend, to complete 52 weeks of domestic violence counseling, to pay \$500 to a domestic violence fund, and to make restitution in an amount to be determined later.²

¹ Count 3 was previously dismissed.

² The record does not include a reporter's transcript for the hearing at which the final restitution amount was determined, and no abstract of judgment was required in this case. (Pen. Code, § 1213; *People v. Gemmill* (2008) 162 Cal.App.4th 958, 962 ["Since defendant was convicted of misdemeanors, there is no abstract of judgment and the sentencing proceedings were not reported"].)

Defendant filed a notice of appeal, and this court appointed counsel to represent him. After examining the record, defense counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues. On January 17, 2018, this court advised defendant he had 30 days to personally submit any contentions or issues he desired us to consider. We received no response.

We have examined the appellate record and are satisfied defendant's attorney on appeal has complied with the responsibilities of counsel and no arguable issue exists. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 278-82; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 122-24; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

BAKER, J.

We concur:

KRIEGLER, Acting P.J.

DUNNING, J.*

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