

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.111.5.
--

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION SIX

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

THOMAS NOLAN YANAGA,

Defendant and Appellant.

2d Crim. No. B287380
(Super. Ct. No. 15F-05954)
(San Luis Obispo County)

Thomas Nolan Yanaga appeals a December 29, 2017 postjudgment order awarding \$9,552.80 restitution to Dylan Savoy and \$4,624.40 restitution to Kenneth Savoy. (Pen Code, § 1202.4, subd. (f)(3).)¹ In 2015, appellant was convicted by jury of second-degree murder of Marshall Savoy (§§ 187, subd. (a); 189) with personal use of a firearm causing death (§ 12022.53, subd. (d)). The trial court sentenced appellant to 40 years to life state prison and ordered appellant to pay \$7,314 restitution to the Victim Compensation and Government Claims Board, now

¹ All statutory references are to the Penal Code.

known as the California Victim Compensation Board (Board). We affirmed the judgment of conviction in an unpublished opinion and, on remand from the Supreme Court, vacated the 25-year-to-life firearm enhancement and remanded for the limited purpose of allowing the trial court to exercise its discretion on whether to strike the firearm enhancement in the interest of justice (§ 1385). (B267571.)

On December 11, 2017, the trial court vacated the restitution order and ordered \$8,772 restitution to the Board. On December 29, 2017, the trial court awarded \$9,552.80 restitution to Dylan Savoy, \$4,624.40 restitution to Kenneth Savoy, and \$515.10 restitution to Leslie Ledesma (the victim's sister in law). (§§ 1202.4, subd. (f)(3); 1202.46.)

We appointed counsel to represent appellant in this appeal. After counsel's examination of the record, she filed an opening brief in which no issues were raised. On June 18, 2018, we advised appellant that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. No response has been received.

We have reviewed the entire record and are satisfied that appellant's attorney has fully complied with her responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 443; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 126.)

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

YEGAN, J.

We concur:

GILBERT, P. J.

PERREN, J.

Michael L. Duffy, Judge

Superior Court County of San Luis Obispo

Jin H. Kim, under appointment by the Court of
Appeal for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance by Respondent.