

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE  
OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

BOBBY GONZALEZ,

Defendant and Appellant.

B294363

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. BA457017)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Richard S. Kemalyan, Judge. Affirmed.

Richard B. Lennon, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance by Respondent.

---

Defendant Bobby Gonzalez appeals his conviction, following a no contest plea, to misdemeanor failure to re-register upon release from incarceration (Pen. Code, § 290.015, subd. (a)). Defendant is a sex offender subject to registration requirements. On January 25, 2017, he was released from jail, after an incarceration lasting more than 30 days, and he failed to re-register.

He was initially charged with felony failure to re-register, but agreed to a negotiated plea to the misdemeanor. He entered the plea on November 19, 2018, was convicted, and appealed shortly thereafter. He sought a certificate of probable cause, seeking to withdraw his plea, claiming he had not been fully informed of all issues surrounding his plea. The court denied his request for a certificate of probable cause. (See *People v. Espinoza* (2018) 22 Cal.App.5th 794, 799.)

On August 24, 2018, defendant's appointed counsel filed a brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*). The brief included a declaration that counsel had written to defendant, explaining the brief that counsel was filing, and informing defendant of his right to file a supplemental brief. This court sent defendant a notice advising him that a *Wende* brief had been filed and that he had 30 days to submit a brief or letter raising any issues he wished us to consider. Defendant did not file a supplemental brief.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that defendant's attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.) Specifically, nothing in the appellate record indicates that defendant possesses any basis to challenge his plea which would

not be barred by his failure to obtain a certificate of probable cause.

**DISPOSITION**

The judgment is affirmed.

RUBIN, P. J.

WE CONCUR:

BAKER, J.

KIM, J.