

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

LEONARD CROZIER,

Defendant and Appellant.

B271444

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. BA435665)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of  
Los Angeles County, Richard S. Kemalyan, Judge. Affirmed.

Dawn S. Mortazavi, under appointment by the Court of  
Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

---

## **FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

In 2015 Leonard Crozier was dating Quaneshia G. and frequently stayed at her apartment when she was gone during the day. One evening Quaneshia returned home and found Crozier sitting on the couch. Crozier began yelling at Quaneshia and threatened to kill her. Because Crozier had previously hit her, Quaneshia became nervous and fled from the apartment. Crozier followed her outside, pushed her into a fence, breaking it, and began to choke her. Quaneshia agreed to return to the apartment, and Crozier loosened his grip. Quaneshia broke away and ran to a group of neighbors, while Crozier pursued her. One of the neighbors told Quaneshia to lock herself inside the neighbor's house. Crozier threatened to shoot up the house if Quaneshia did not come outside. Two of the neighbors called the police.

Testifying in his defense, Crozier denied threatening, choking, or otherwise harming Quaneshia. According to Crozier, Quaneshia appeared drunk when she came home that night. She left the apartment and began removing her clothing. Crozier went outside to stop Quaneshia by shielding her body, attempting to prevent her from taking off her shirt, and helping her pull up her pants. Quaneshia testified she was fully clothed when she ran from her apartment but at some point removed her jacket while she was outside. The neighbors testified she was naked while Crozier was choking her.

Quaneshia suffered a scraped elbow, swollen right palm, and lower back pain as a result of the attack. She also experienced some difficulty breathing for two or three days.

The People charged Crozier with willfully inflicting corporal injury on someone with whom he had a dating relationship (Pen. Code,<sup>1</sup> § 273.5, subd. (a)), assault by means of force likely to produce great bodily injury (§ 245, subd. (a)(4)), and making a criminal threat (§ 422, subd. (a)). The People also alleged Crozier had suffered one prior serious or violent felony conviction within the meaning of the three strikes law (§§ 667, subds. (b)-(j), 1170.12) and section 667, subdivision (a)(1), and had served three separate prison terms for felonies within the meaning of section 667.5, subdivision (b).

The jury acquitted Crozier of willfully inflicting corporal injury on someone with whom he had a dating relationship, but convicted him of the lesser included offense of battery against a person with whom the defendant currently has, or has previously had, a dating relationship (§ 243, subd. (e)(1)). The jury also convicted Crozier of assault by means of force likely to produce great bodily injury and acquitted him of making a criminal threat. In a bifurcated proceeding, Crozier admitted the prior conviction allegations.

The trial court sentenced Crozier to an aggregate prison term of seven years, consisting of six years (the middle term of three years doubled under the three strikes law) for assault by means of force likely to produce great bodily injury, plus one year for a prior prison term enhancement, and stayed execution of sentence on the conviction for battery pursuant to section 654. The court dismissed the remaining two prior prison term enhancements in the interest of justice. Crozier timely appealed.

---

<sup>1</sup> Statutory references are to the Penal Code.

## DISCUSSION

We appointed counsel to represent Crozier on appeal. After reviewing the record, counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues. On March 27, 2017 we advised Crozier he had 30 days to submit a brief or letter raising any grounds of appeal, contentions, or arguments he wanted us to consider. We have not received a response.

We have examined the record and are satisfied appellate counsel for Crozier has complied with her responsibilities and there are no arguable issues. (See *Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 277-284 [120 S.Ct. 746, 145 L.Ed.2d 756]; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 118-119; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441-442.)

## DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

SEGAL, J.

We concur:

PERLUSS, P. J.

MENETREZ, J.\*

---

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