Filed 1/16/13 P. v. Thompson CA2/2

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE, Plaintiff and Respondent, v. KASHA LANAY THOMPSON, Defendant and Appellant.	B242860 (Los Angeles County Super. Ct. No. BA384047)

THE COURT:*

Appellant Kasha Lanay Thompson appeals from the judgment entered following her plea of no contest to a felony count of arson of an inhabited structure or property in violation of Penal Code section 451, subdivision (b). Pursuant to the plea agreement, appellant was sentenced to the low term of three years in state prison.

We appointed counsel to represent appellant on this appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an "Opening Brief" in which no arguable issues were raised. On October 11, 2012, we advised appellant that she had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues that she wished us to consider.

---

* BOREN, P. J., DOI TODD, J., ASHMANN-GERST, J.

Appellant submitted a response on October 31, 2012, claiming that testimony given at the preliminary hearing was untruthful and that she was manipulated by the arson investigator, but without any citation to the record or any legal authority to support her assertions. Moreover, the record does not contain a certificate of probable cause executed by the trial court. Without such a certificate, no appeal can be taken from a judgment of conviction upon a plea of no contest. (Pen. Code, § 1237.5.) Although certain exceptions exist, such as when the issues on appeal arose after entry of the plea and do not affect its validity (see Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.304(b)(4)), that is not the case here. Appellant's claims directly affect the plea's validity.

In any event, we have examined the entire record and conclude that it provides a factual basis to support the conviction. The record shows that, on March 28, 2011, at about 9:00 p.m., appellant went to the job site of her former boyfriend, Larry Carter, and told him she hated him, threw a bottle at him, and tried to hit him with her car. Carter left work about 10 minutes later and went to a liquor store. When he started walking on his street, where he lived in a duplex house, he saw appellant driving her car away from his house. Appellant was alone in the car. As Carter reached his front door, he heard the smoke detector and alarm sounding. When he opened the door, he saw his house engulfed in flames and called 9-1-1.

William Vlendick, an arson investigator for the Los Angeles Fire Department, went to Carter's residence on March 28, 2011, and determined that the fire was intentionally set with an open-flame device below a living room window. On April 8, 2011, he and his partner spoke with appellant at her residence. They explained their presence and told her that she did not have to speak with them and could ask them to leave at any time. Appellant stated that she had gone to Carter's work, they had a confrontation, and she left. She denied any involvement in the fire. After they told her she had been identified as being in the area, appellant admitted starting the fire by igniting a dish towel with a lighter and leaving it on an open windowsill.

Neither the record nor appellant's response demonstrate the existence of any cognizable issues on appeal. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS.