

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

MARIA D. MURGA,

Defendant and Appellant.

B253105

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. BA405440)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Clifford L. Klein, Judge. Affirmed.

Landra E. Rosenthal, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

---

On September 28, 2012, Sonia Lopez was waiting in line to pick her children up from school when she witnessed appellant Maria Murga scratching her truck with a metal object. Lopez called the police, and Murga was ultimately arrested and charged with felony vandalism. (Pen. Code, § 594, subd. (a).)

At trial, Lopez and her friend Sara Valencia testified that they saw Murga scratch Lopez's truck. At the close of this evidence the court denied Murga's motion for acquittal, finding the evidence, which included photographs and the testimony of Lopez and Valencia, was sufficient to sustain a conviction. (Pen. Code, § 1118.1.) Murga and her fiancé, Osvaldo Arana, then testified Arana picked up their children from school on the day of the vandalism, and Murga was not at the school that day and did not vandalize Lopez's truck.

Murga was convicted and sentenced to serve 34 days in county jail and was placed on three years of formal probation. The court awarded Murga 17 days actual custody credit and 17 days good time/work time credit. She paid \$1,200.00 in restitution (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (f)) and was ordered to pay a \$280.00 restitution fine (Pen. Code, § 1202.4, subd. (b)), a \$40.00 court operations assessment (Pen. Code, § 1465.8, subd. (a)(1)), and a \$30.00 criminal conviction assessment (Gov. Code, § 70373). A \$280.00 probation revocation fine was levied and suspended pending revocation of her probation. (Pen. Code, § 1202.44.)

Murga timely appealed. We appointed counsel to represent her on appeal, and after examination of the record, appointed counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues and asking this court to independently review the record. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441-442.) On April 22, 2014, we sent letters to Murga and appointed counsel, directing counsel to forward the appellate record to Murga and advising Murga that within 30 days she could personally submit any contentions or issues she wished us to consider. To date she has not responded.

We have examined the entire record and find no arguable issue exists. We are therefore satisfied that Murga's attorney complied with her responsibilities and affirm the judgment. (*People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 441.)

**DISPOSITION**

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

CHANEY, J.

We concur:

ROTHSCHILD, P. J.

JOHNSON, J.