

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

JAIME MUNDO JULIAN,

Defendant and Appellant.

B290500

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. BA302360)

THE COURT:

Defendant Jaime Mundo Julian appeals from the judgment entered after the Superior Court terminated his probation and ordered the execution of the previously suspended prison sentence. His appointed counsel filed a brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*), raising no issues. On September 5, 2018, we notified defendant of his counsel's brief and gave him leave to file, within 30 days, his own brief or letter stating any grounds or argument he might wish to have considered. That time has elapsed, and defendant has submitted

no brief or letter. We have reviewed the entire record, and finding no arguable issues, affirm the judgment.

In 2006, defendant was convicted following a plea of guilty, of four felony counts and sentenced to eight years eight months in prison. Execution of sentence was suspended, and defendant was placed on formal probation for five years under specified conditions, including custody in county jail. Defendant was deported upon his release from jail, and failed to contact the probation department. In 2016, defendant was arrested, found to be in violation of probation due to his failure to comply with several conditions of probation. In addition, the court found a violation based upon offenses which occurred after the expiration of the five-year probationary period. The court revoked probation and ordered execution of the suspended sentence of eight years eight months in prison. After defendant appealed from the judgment, the matter was affirmed in part, reversed in part, and remanded to the trial court to exercise discretion to terminate probation based solely upon events that occurred before the expiration of the probationary period, or to reinstate probation. (*People v. Julian* (Nov. 22, 2017, B280043) [nonpub. opn.] )

On remand, the trial court again terminated probation and ordered the execution of the previously suspended sentence of eight years eight months in prison, based on defendant's failure to make any contact with the probation department; to provide probation with his contact information; to begin meeting his financial obligations; or to explore domestic violence classes.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that defendant's appellate counsel has fully complied with her responsibilities and that no arguable issue exists. We conclude that 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 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 judgment is affirmed.

---

LUI, P.J.

CHAVEZ, J.

HOFFSTADT, J.