#### NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.111.5.

## IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

#### SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

#### **DIVISION SIX**

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

2d Crim. No. B235795 (Super. Ct. No. YA077103) (Los Angeles County)

v.

MICHAEL J. BUSH,

Defendant and Appellant.

Michael J. Bush appeals from the judgment entered after he plead no contest to second degree burglary (Pen. Code, § 459)<sup>1</sup> and admitted a prior strike conviction (§§ 667, subds. (b) – (i); 1170.12, subds. (a) – (d)). Pursuant to the negotiated plea, appellant was sentenced to 32 months state prison and ordered to pay a \$200 restitution fine (§ 1202.4, subd. (b)), a \$200 parole revocation fine (§ 1202.45), a \$40 court security fee (§ 1465.8), a \$30 criminal conviction assessment (Gov. Code § 70373), and a \$10 crime prevention fine (§ 1202.5).

Appellant filed a notice of appeal and a request for certificate of probable cause which was denied by the trial court. (§ 1237.5, subd. (a).) The request for certificate of probable cause alleges that appellant was denied due process because the prosecution failed to produce a store video surveillance tape.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Unless otherwise stated, all statutory references are to the Penal Code.

The preliminary hearing transcript reflects that, on January 21, 2010, a Target Store loss prevention officer observed appellant put an alarm clock, a DVD player, a digital camera, and an umbrella in a shopping cart and push the cart out the store without paying. Appellant was detained and admitted stealing the merchandise.

We appointed counsel to represent appellant in this appeal. After counsel's examination of the record, he filed an opening brief in which no issues were raised.

On March 21, 2012, we advised appellant that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. No response has been received.

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* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 443; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 126.)

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

YEGAN, J.

We concur:

GILBERT, P.J.

PERREN, J.

### Eric C. Taylor, Judge

# Superior Court County of Los Angeles

James Koester, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, fr Defendant and

Appellant.

No appearance for Respondent.