

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

ARCHIE LAWRENCE CRANFORD,

Defendant and Appellant.

B267548

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. ZM013025)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,  
Douglas Sortino, Judge.

Susan S. Bauguess, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for  
Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Respondent.

Under the Sexually Violent Predator Act (SVPA), Welfare and Institutions Code sections 6600 et seq., a person who is found to be a sexually violent predator (SVP) beyond a reasonable doubt by a unanimous jury may be involuntarily committed to a state mental hospital for an indefinite term. (*People v. Johnson* (2015) 235 Cal.App.4th 80, 83.)<sup>1</sup> The SVPA defines an SVP as “a person who has been convicted of a sexually violent offense against one or more victims and who has a diagnosed mental disorder that makes the person a danger to the health and safety of others in that it is likely that he or she will engage in sexually violent criminal behavior.” (§ 6600, subd. (a)(1).)

On March 19, 2008, the Los Angeles County district attorney filed a petition seeking to have appellant Archie Lawrence Cranford committed pursuant to the SVPA. At trial, the prosecutor presented evidence that appellant had suffered three prior convictions for rape. Dr. Robert Owen, a clinical psychologist, testified he conducted 11 psychological evaluations of appellant, most recently on February 5, 2015. He diagnosed appellant with “other specified paraphilia disorder.” Paraphilia is the general term for several sexual disorders, including pedophilia, exhibitionism and sexual sadism. Appellant’s specific paraphilic disorder relates to his sexual arousal from dominating or subduing nonconsenting females.

Dr. Owen scored appellant at six on the Static 99R, -- a risk assessment tool -- which indicated that appellant had a 25.7 percent likelihood to reoffend within five years and a 37.3 percent likelihood within 10 years. That score is higher than 94 percent of other sexual offenders. Appellant also had other risk factors for sexually reoffending, including lack of family support, a history of intimacy problems, problems with general self-control, and lack of cooperation with supervision -- the strongest risk factor. Appellant also showed signs of

---

<sup>1</sup> All further statutory citations are to the Welfare and Institutions Code, unless otherwise stated.

psychopathy. His score on an assessment test placed him within the “severe psychopathy range,” raising concerns due to a psychopath’s failure to learn from mistakes, tendency to repeat dysfunctional behavior, and failure to care for other people. Based on the high Static 99R score and the other risk factors, Dr. Owen opined that appellant posed “a serious, well-founded risk of committing new sexual crimes.”

Dr. Marianne Davis, another psychologist, evaluated appellant four times, most recently on August 21, 2015. She diagnosed him with sexual sadism, a paraphilic disorder involving sexual excitement or arousal from the physical or psychological suffering of the victim. Dr. Davis scored appellant at six on the Static 99R. She also noted that appellant had been in the hospital since 1997, sporadically attended treatment programs since that time, and had refused to participate in any treatment program over the past few years. (See *People v. Roberge* (2003) 29 Cal.4th 979, 988, fn. 2 [“Evidence of the person’s amenability to voluntary treatment, if any is presented, is relevant to the ultimate determination whether the person is likely to engage in sexually violent predatory crimes if released from custody.”].) Dr. Davis scored appellant at 29 on a commonly-used psychopathy checklist, indicating that “he has a lot of traits of a psychopath.” Based on appellant’s scores and prior behavior, Dr. Davis opined that he posed a serious and well-founded risk for reoffense.

The jury found appellant met the criteria for commitment as an SVP. A commitment order was filed September 10, 2015. Appellant timely filed a notice of appeal.

After examining the record, appointed appellate counsel filed a brief raising no issues, but asking this court to independently review the record on appeal pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441-442. (See *Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 264.) On June 17, 2016, we advised appellant he

had 30 days within which to submit by brief or letter any contentions or argument he wished this court to consider. No response was received.

This court has examined the entire record in accordance with *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at pages 441-442, and is satisfied appellant's attorney has fully complied with the responsibilities of counsel, and no arguable issues exist. Accordingly, we affirm the commitment order.

### **DISPOSITION**

The order is affirmed.

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS.**

MANELLA, J.

We concur:

WILLHITE, Acting P. J.

COLLINS, J.