

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

LISA G. OCHOA,

Defendant and Appellant.

B257479

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. PA072334)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,
Hyden Zacky, Judge. Affirm.

Carlos Ramirez, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant
and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Lisa Ochoa appeals from the judgment entered after the trial court revoked her probation and imposed a previously suspended three-year sentence. Her appointed counsel filed a *Wende* brief. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436.) On December 16, 2014, we directed appointed counsel to send the record and a copy of the brief to appellant and notified appellant of her right to respond within 30 days. We received no response.

In March 2012, appellant pled no contest to a violation of Health and Safety Code section 11366 (maintaining dwelling for sale or use of controlled substance). She was placed on probation and required to complete a year in a residential drug treatment program. Execution of her three-year sentence, including various fines and fees, was suspended. Appellant was given one day of presentence credit. In 2013, her probation was repeatedly revoked and reinstated for various violations.

In June 2014, appellant admitted she had violated her probation yet again by picking up a new drug offense. The court revoked her probation, and imposed the previously suspended three-year sentence. Appellant was given 577 days of presentence credit, based on her completion of an 18-month residential drug program. All previously imposed fines and fees remained in place.

Having reviewed the record, we are satisfied that no arguable issues for appeal exist. We note that the abstract of judgment incorrectly reflects a \$300 parole revocation fine in place of the \$240 probation revocation fine the court actually imposed.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed. The abstract of judgment should be corrected to reflect the court imposed a probation revocation fine of \$240.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

EPSTEIN, P. J.

We concur:

MANELLA, J.

COLLINS, J.