

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

HILDA GONZALEZ,

Defendant and Appellant.

B271476

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. VA138826)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of
Los Angeles County. John A. Torribio, Judge. Affirmed.

Janet Gusdorff, under appointment by the Court of Appeal,
for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance by Plaintiff and Respondent.

An information, filed on April 9, 2015, charged appellant Hilda Gonzalez with one count of the sale/offer to sell/transport a controlled substance, methamphetamine, in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11379, subdivision (a) in count 1 and possession for sale of a controlled substance, methamphetamine, in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11378 in count 2.

The jury found appellant guilty on both counts. Appellant was sentenced to three years probation under specified terms and conditions, including serving 270 days in a Los Angeles County Jail. The court awarded appellant a total of 32 days (i.e., 16 actual days plus 16 good time/work time) and imposed various statutory fines and fees for her convictions. Appellant's notice of appeal disclosed that she intended to challenge her convictions based on "insufficiency of the evidence" and other unidentified legal and factual grounds.

We appointed counsel to represent appellant in the matter. After examining the record, counsel filed a *Wende* brief raising no issues on appeal and requesting that we independently review the record. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) On November 28, 2016, we sent a letter to appellant and to counsel. In the letter, we directed counsel to immediately send the record in this appeal and a copy of the *Wende* brief to appellant and informed appellant that she had 30 days to submit by letter or brief any ground of appeal, contention or argument she wished us to consider. We did not receive a response from her.

We have reviewed the entire record on appeal. Substantial evidence presented at trial shows that when the police arrested appellant she carried more than three grams of methamphetamine in seven separate bindles in her purse, and that she confessed to the officers that she possessed the methamphetamine to sell it. The evidence also showed that given the quantity and packaging of the methamphetamine and the lack of other indicia of personal use,

appellant's possession of the drug was indicative of possession for sale rather than for personal use. (*People v. Johnson* (1980) 26 Cal.3d 557, 578 [substantial evidence is that which is "reasonable, credible, and of solid value—such that a reasonable trier of fact could find the defendant guilty beyond a reasonable doubt"].) This evidence is sufficient to support appellant's convictions, notwithstanding appellant's testimony at trial that she intended to use, not resell the methamphetamine. (*People v. Holt* (1997) 15 Cal.4th 619, 668 [Under the substantial evidence standard of review, we resolve all conflicts in the evidence and indulge all reasonable inferences to support the judgment; that other evidence might reasonably be reconciled with a contrary result does not warrant a reversal of the judgment.].) We are satisfied that counsel has fully complied with her responsibilities and that no arguable appellate issue exists. (*People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 441; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 110.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

ROTHSCHILD, P. J.

We concur:

CHANEY, J.

JOHNSON, J.