

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ANTONIO GONZALES,

Defendant and Appellant.

2d Crim. No. B233876  
(Super. Ct. No. VA118649 )  
(Los Angeles County)

Antonio Gonzales appeals the judgment entered after a jury convicted him of two counts of indecent exposure (Pen. Code, § 314, subd. 1)<sup>1</sup> and possession of a controlled substance (Health & Saf. Code, § 11377, subd. (a)). Appellant stipulated that he suffered a prior section 314, subdivision (1) conviction. The court sentenced him to 4 years 4 months in state prison (a 3-year base term for indecent exposure; and one 8-month term for each of his other offenses (indecent exposure and possession of a controlled substance)).

On February 10, 2011, appellant entered a clothing store, stood near a rack of baby clothes, exposed his genitals and masturbated for several minutes. He left the clothing store, where he sat at a table with his coffee and a magazine. A few minutes after he sat down, Starbucks employees noticed he was masturbating. Los Angeles County Deputy Sheriffs arrested him at Starbucks. During a search at the station,

---

<sup>1</sup> All statutory references are to the Penal Code unless otherwise stated.

deputies found a paper bindle and a plastic baggie in appellant's sock. The bindle and baggie held a combined total of .43 grams of methamphetamine.

We appointed counsel to represent appellant on appeal. After counsel filed a brief raising no issues and requesting our independent review pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, we notified appellant that he had 30 days in which to advise us of any claims he wished us to consider. No brief was filed.

We have reviewed the entire record and are satisfied that appellant's attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 441.) The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

PERREN, J.

We concur:

GILBERT, P.J.

YEGAN, J.

Margaret Miller Bernal, Judge

Superior Court County of Los Angeles

---

Arielle Bases, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant  
and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.