

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

JOSE FRANCISCO OROZCO,

Defendant and Appellant.

B284025

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. MA066777)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Charles A. Chung, Judge. Affirmed.

Alan S. Yockelson, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

On August 20, 2015, Jose Francisco Orozco stole a car and was caught by police less than a mile away. About a week later, while released on bail, he carjacked the vehicle of a defense attorney in the underground parking structure of the Men's Central Jail in Los Angeles. That evening, he attempted to carjack another car but was thwarted after beating the driver.

After proceedings to determine whether Orozco was competent to stand trial, and several delays due to his serial illnesses and refusal to attend trial, a jury convicted him of felony car theft (Veh. Code, § 10851, subd. (a)), carjacking and attempted carjacking (Pen. Code, §§ 664/215, subd. (a)), and two counts of robbery (Pen. Code, § 211).

Orozco was sentenced as follows: Eleven years for carjacking, comprising the upper term of nine years plus two years for having committed the crime while released on bail (Pen. Code, § 12022.1); eight consecutive months for car theft; and 10 consecutive months for attempted carjacking, for a total of 12 years and 6 months. The court imposed but stayed sentences for the robbery counts, gave custody credit of 696 actual days plus 104 good conduct days, and ordered Orozco to provide a DNA sample (Pen. Code, § 296) and pay a restitution fine of \$6,000 (Pen. Code, § 1202.4).

Orozco filed a timely notice of appeal. We appointed counsel to represent him on appeal, but after examination of the record counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues and asking this court to review the record independently pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436. On February 22, 2018, we informed Orozco he had 30 days to submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. We also directed his appointed

counsel to send the record and opening brief to him immediately.
We received no response.

We have examined the entire record and conclude Orozco's counsel complied with the responsibilities set forth in *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106 and *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at page 441. No arguable issues exist.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.
NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

CHANNEY, Acting P. J.

We concur:

JOHNSON, J.

BENDIX, J.