

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

CHRISTOPHER BROWN,

Defendant and Appellant.

B296342

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. TA112788)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Laura Walton, Judge. Affirmed.

A. William Bartz, Jr., under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

---

On October 15, 2009, Christopher Brown and an accomplice entered a Boost Mobile phone store in which there were three employees and a fourth person. Brown, armed with an assault weapon, pointed the weapon at the four individuals and ordered them to lie down, then stole approximately \$4,000 to \$5,000 worth of money and cell phones from the store. Brown was arrested two weeks later, and a search of his apartment recovered the assault rifle hidden in a ceiling vent.

A jury convicted Brown of three counts of robbery (Pen. Code, § 211),<sup>1</sup> one count of assault with a firearm (§ 245, subd. (a)(2)), and one count of possession of an assault weapon (former § 12280, subd. (b)), and found true special allegations that he personally used an assault weapon in commission of the robbery. (Former § 12022.5, subd. (a).) He was sentenced to 23 years and 4 months in prison, consisting of a three-year term on the first robbery count, two consecutive one-year terms on the second and third robbery counts, a consecutive one-year term on the assault count, and a consecutive eight-month term on the possession count. Added to these were a consecutive 10-year term pursuant to the assault weapon allegation attached to the first robbery count and two consecutive three-year, four-month terms pursuant to the same allegations attached to the second and third robbery counts. (Former § 12022.5, subd. (b).)

At sentencing, the court explained its decision to impose consecutive rather than concurrent sentences as follows: “In this situation, there were four people in this shop, and the defendant chose to come in with a firearm. And these people were terrified,

---

<sup>1</sup> Undesignated statutory references will be to the Penal Code.

and each individual one had a different experience. So I don't find that, under these circumstances, it warrants a concurrent time."

We affirmed the conviction. (*People v. Brown* (Sept. 11, 2012, B231267) [nonpub. opn.].)

On January 8, 2019, Brown petitioned the superior court to modify his sentence. In a wide ranging 45-page cut-and-paste amalgam of at least four documents in three fonts, including what appear to be a habeas petition and briefs filed in the course of another appeal, he argued, as pertinent to his petition, that the sentencing court erred by failing to stay the sentences on certain counts and by failing to articulate its reasons for imposing consecutive rather than concurrent terms. The trial court denied the petition on the ground that the sentencing court had adequately explained its decisions.

Brown appeals the order denying his petition.

We appointed counsel to represent Brown on appeal. After examination of the record, appointed counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues and asking this court to review the record independently. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441-442.) On October 21, 2019, we sent letters to Brown and appointed counsel, directing counsel to immediately forward the appellate record to Brown and advising him that within 30 days he could personally submit any contentions or issues that he wished us to consider. He has not responded. We have examined the entire record and find no arguable issue exists, and are therefore satisfied Brown's attorney complied with his responsibilities. (*Id.* at p. 441.)

**DISPOSITION**

The order is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

CHANEY, J.

We concur:

ROTHSCHILD, P. J.

BENDIX, J.