

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

JONATHAN CERVANTES,

Defendant and Appellant.

B253397

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. BA407022)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,  
Craig J. Mitchell, Judge. Affirmed.

Mark J. Shusted, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant  
and Appellant.

No appearance for Respondent.

Defendant and appellant Jonathan Cervantes appeals from a judgment entered following a jury trial in which he was convicted of grand theft (Pen. Code, § 487, subd. (a)), with the finding by the court (following appellant's admission) that he had served a prison term within the meaning of Penal Code section 667.5, subdivision (b).<sup>1</sup> As here relevant, the evidence at trial showed that defendant and a male companion entered the studio used by a deejay during a party at 2515 West 7th Street in Los Angeles. After they left, the laptop used by the deejay was found missing. The court sentenced appellant to the upper term of three years and imposed an additional one-year enhancement pursuant to Penal Code section 667, subdivision (b) for a total of four years. The court suspended execution of sentence and placed appellant on probation for three years, under the condition that he serve 372 days in jail. The court also awarded 186 days of presentence actual custody credits and 186 of presentence conduct credits, for a total of 372 days of credit.

After review of the record, appellant's court-appointed counsel filed an opening brief asking this court to review the record independently pursuant to the holding of *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.

On August 26, 2014, we advised appellant that he had 30 days within which to submit any contentions or issues that he wished us to consider. No response has been received to date.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that no arguable issues exist, and that appellant has, by virtue of counsel's compliance with the *Wende* procedure and our review of the record, received adequate and effective appellate review of the judgment entered against him in this case. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 278; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 112-113.)

---

<sup>1</sup> The jury acquitted him of burglary (§ 459), robbery (§ 211), and found gang allegations (§ 186.22, subd. (b)(1)(A)) in all counts not true.

**DISPOSITION**

The judgment is affirmed.

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

WILLHITE, Acting P.J.

We concur:

MANELLA, J.

COLLINS, J.