

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

KENJUAN D. ADAMS,

Defendant and Appellant.

B256337

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. MA029006)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Kathleen Kennedy, Judge. Affirmed.

Jonathan B. Steiner and Ann Krausz, under appointment by the Court of Appeal,
for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

In 2006, a jury convicted Kenjuan D. Adams of premeditated murder and two counts of attempted premeditated murder and found true the special allegations that he had personally and intentionally discharged a firearm causing death or great bodily injury during the commission of the offenses. The jury also convicted Adams of possession of a firearm by a felon. The trial court sentenced Adams to multiple terms of life and twenty-five years to life in state prison. It also imposed a \$10,000 restitution fine under Penal Code section 1202.4, subdivision (b), and a concomitant \$10,000 parole revocation restitution fine under Penal Code section 1202.45, subdivision (a), as well as victim restitution of \$3,300. Adams appealed, and we affirmed the judgment in an unpublished opinion. (*People v. Adams* (Feb. 28, 2008, B193174) [nonpub. opn.].) He did not challenge the fines or victim restitution in his appeal.

On February 28, 2014, Adams filed a motion for modification of sentence, contending that the trial court imposed the \$10,000 restitution fine and the \$3,300 in victim restitution “based on the erroneous assumption that [he] could pay [them] out of his earnings while incarcerated in state prison.” He also filed a supplemental motion for modification. The trial court denied the motions. Adams appealed.

We appointed counsel to represent Adams 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 September 16, 2014, we directed appointed counsel to immediately send the record on this appeal and a copy of the opening brief to Adams and notified Adams that within 30 days from the date of the notice he could submit by letter or brief any ground of appeal, contention or argument he wished us to consider. On September 29, 2014, Adams filed a letter with this court attaching a copy of what he says is the supplemental motion he filed in the trial court in which he argues on several grounds that the fines and victim restitution are improper.

We have examined the entire record, and reviewed Adams’s submission to this court, and see no basis to modify the imposed fines or victim restitution. The fines are within the statutory parameters, and although Adams argues improprieties in the

imposition of the fines and victim restitution, he does not support his arguments with evidence demonstrating error. We are satisfied that Adams's attorneys have fully complied with their 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 order is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

ROTHSCHILD, P. J.

We concur:

CHANEY, J.

JOHNSON, J.