

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

TOMIKO S. TYLER,

Defendant and Appellant.

2d Crim. No. B279016  
(Super. Ct. No. 6PH06272)  
(Los Angeles County)

Tomiko S. Tyler appeals an order revoking and modifying parole terms to include an additional 180 days custody in county jail and enrollment in substance abuse classes. (Pen. Code, § 1237, subd. (b); see *People v. Vickers* (1972) 8 Cal.3d 451, 453, fn. 2 [appealable as a postjudgment order affecting a defendant's substantial rights].)

On August 29, 2016, Tyler charged his GPS device as instructed. The next day, his parole agent received three notifications over several hours showing that the battery was running out, in violation of the condition that the device be charged twice a day. Although instructed to immediately contact

his parole agent when the device began to vibrate due to low battery power, Tyler did not do so.

Tyler was instructed to charge his device and report to parole. When he did so, the parole agent determined that the device and battery were in working order. Tyler was asked to submit a urine sample for testing, whereupon Tyler admitted using methamphetamine and marijuana in violation of his parole terms.

The trial court found that Tyler violated the conditions of his parole. It revoked and then restored parole with additional custody time and enrollment in a drug program.

We appointed counsel to represent Tyler in this appeal. After counsel's examination of the record, she filed an opening brief that raised no arguable issues. On March 20, 2017, we advised Tyler by mail that he had 30 days within which to submit any contentions or issues that he wished to raise on appeal. We have not received a response.

We have reviewed the entire record and are satisfied that Tyler's attorney fully complied with her responsibilities and that no arguable issue exists. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

The order is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

TANGEMAN, J.

We concur:

GILBERT, P. J.

YEGAN, J.

Jacqueline H. Lewis, Judge

Superior Court County of Los Angeles

---

Heather Shallenberger, under appointment by the  
Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.