

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

JASON F. HEIDEN,

Defendant and Appellant.

2d Crim. No. B239556
(Super. Ct. No. F457163)
(San Luis Obispo County)

Jason F. Heiden (“Heiden”) appeals from the judgment of conviction by a no-contest plea to first-degree residential burglary, in violation of Penal Code¹ section 459, and grand theft of a firearm, in violation of section 487, subdivision (d); Heiden also admitted that the burglary was of an inhabited dwelling house, in violation of section 462, subdivision (a). The charges stem from Heiden’s theft of a rare coin collection, a stamp collection, and other memorabilia from the 85-year-old man whom Heiden had, for much of the prior year, cared for as a caretaker. The trial court imposed a total sentence of two years in state prison, and imposed restitution to the victim as the value of the stolen collections and memorabilia in the amount of \$677,532.50.

¹ All statutory references are to the Penal Code.

We appointed counsel to represent Heiden in this appeal. After counsel's examination of the record, she filed an opening brief raising no issues.

On July 20, 2012, we advised Heiden by mail that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues that he wished to raise on appeal. On August 1, 2012, the letter was returned as undeliverable. We sent a second letter on August 8, 2012, to a forwarding address. That letter was not returned and Heiden did not respond.

We have reviewed the entire record, with special attention to the imposition and calculation of the restitution amount owed. We are satisfied that Heiden's attorney has fully complied with her responsibilities and that no arguable issue exists. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

HOFFSTADT, J.*

We concur:

GILBERT, P.J.

YEGAN, J.

* Assigned by the Chairperson of the Judicial Council.

Roger T. Picquet, Judge
Jacquelyn H. Duffy, Judge
Superior Court County of San Luis Obispo

Miriam R. Arichea, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for
Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.