

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

DAJUAN MALCOLM JACKSON,

Defendant and Appellant.

B264654

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. BA316158)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Stephen A. Marcus, Judge. Affirmed.

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

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

This case comes to us pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*). Having reviewed the record, we affirm the judgment. We provide the following brief summation of the factual and procedural history of the case. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 110, 124 (*Kelly*).)

In 2007, Dajuan Malcolm Jackson repeatedly stabbed his girlfriend with a knife and was convicted of mayhem, assault with a deadly weapon, and inflicting corporal injury on a cohabitant. Because he had prior strike convictions (related to shooting three victims), Jackson was sentenced under the “Three Strikes” law to a term of 34 years to life.

Following passage of Proposition 36 (a statewide initiative approved on Nov. 6, 2012 allowing for resentencing if a person’s third strike conviction was not serious or violent), Jackson filed a petition seeking resentencing. The trial court denied the petition, because his current convictions are for violent felonies, which makes him ineligible for resentencing under Penal Code section 1170.126.

After review of the record, Jackson’s court-appointed counsel filed an opening brief requesting that this court independently review the record to determine whether there are any arguable issues on appeal. (*Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at pp. 441–442.) On September 14, 2015, we directed appointed counsel to immediately send the record on appeal and a copy of the opening brief to Jackson and notified Jackson that within 30 days from the date of the notice he could submit by letter or brief any ground of appeal, contention or argument he wishes us to consider. To date, we have received no response.

We have examined the record in accordance with our obligations under *Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at pages 436, 441. We are satisfied that Jackson received adequate and effective appellate review of the judgment in this action, that his counsel fully complied with his responsibilities, and that no arguable issues exist. (*Kelly, supra*, 40 Cal.4th at pp. 109–110; *Wende*, at p. 443.)

DISPOSITION

The order is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

JOHNSON, J.

We concur:

ROTHSCHILD, P. J.

LUI, J.