

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

DANIEL RUBEN LOPEZ,

Defendant and Appellant.

B281035

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. KA091724)

THE COURT:*

On January 25, 2011, the Los Angeles County District Attorney's Office filed an information charging defendant and appellant Daniel Ruben Lopez with attempted murder (Pen.

* ASHMANN-GERST, Acting P. J., HOFFSTADT, J., GOODMAN, J.†

† Retired judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.

Code, §§ 187, 664) and shooting at an occupied vehicle (Pen. Code, § 246). It was further alleged that in the commission of these offenses, a principal intentionally discharged a firearm, causing injury or death (Pen. Code, § 12022.53, subds. (d) & (e)(1)), and that the crimes were committed for the benefit of, at the direction of, and in association with a criminal street gang (Pen. Code, § 186.22, subd. (b)(1)(C)).

On October 31, 2011, defendant pleaded no contest to count 1 in exchange for a determinate sentence of 25 years in state prison, consisting of five years for the attempted murder and 20 years for the gun allegation. That same date, he was sentenced as agreed.

On January 24, 2017, defendant filed, in superior court, a pleading titled “Notice of Motion to Petition for Writ of Error Coram Nobis, Memorandum of Points and Authorities, Declaration Included.” Approximately one week later, the trial court denied defendant’s petition.

This timely appeal ensued.

Counsel was appointed to represent defendant in connection with this appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an “Opening Brief” in which no arguable issues were raised. On August 29, 2017, we advised defendant that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues for us to consider.

No response has been received to date.

We have examined the entire record and we are satisfied that defendant's appellate counsel has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441 (*Wende*).)

Defendant 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 and sentence entered against him in this case. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 278; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 123–124.)

The trial court's order is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS.