

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JUAN LOPEZ LARA,

Defendant and Appellant.

B265003

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. KA025844)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,
Wade Olson, Judge. Affirmed.

Carlos Ramirez, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant
and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

* * * * *

Juan Lopez Lara appeals an order denying a motion to reconsider the trial court's denial of a petition for resentencing pursuant to Penal Code section 1170.18, enacted by Proposition 47. Pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*), appellant's counsel filed an opening brief requesting this court review the record and determine whether any arguable issues exist on appeal. We have reviewed the entire record and find no arguable issue. We affirm.

BACKGROUND

On March 28, 1995, a felony information charged appellant with possession of methamphetamine for sale (Health & Saf. Code, § 11378; count 1) and selling methamphetamine (Health & Saf. Code, § 11379, subd. (a); count 2). On April 28, 1995, appellant pled no contest to count 1, and he was placed on three years of formal probation. On May 24, 1996, appellant admitted he violated the terms of his probation, which was revoked. He was sentenced to two years in state prison.

More than 18 years later, on December 30, 2014, the trial court received from appellant a petition for recall of his sentence and resentencing pursuant to Penal Code section 1170.18. The court denied the petition on January 21, 2015. On May 6, 2015, appellant filed a motion to reconsider that denial, which the court denied. Appellant timely appealed from that order.

DISCUSSION

We appointed counsel to represent appellant on this appeal. After review of the record, appellant's court-appointed counsel filed an opening brief asking this court to review the record independently pursuant to *Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at page 441. On October 15, 2015, we advised appellant he had 30 days to submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. Appellant did not file a supplemental brief.

We have examined the entire record. We are satisfied no arguable issues exist and appellant's counsel has fully satisfied his responsibilities under *Wende*.

(*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 279-284; *Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 441; see *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 123-124.)

DISPOSITION

The court's order is affirmed.

FLIER, J.

WE CONCUR:

BIGELOW, P. J.

RUBIN, J.