

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

TANYA CHRISTINE BYER,

Defendant and Appellant.

B235988

(Los Angeles County Super. Ct.  
No. KA091867)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Mike Camacho, Judge. Affirmed.

Jolene Larimore, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

---

Defendant and appellant Tanya Christine Byer was convicted by jury of forgery (Pen. Code, § 470, subd. (d)) and procuring or offering a forged document (Pen. Code, § 115). She was placed on probation for three years, conditioned on service of 365 days in county jail. A post-sentencing restitution hearing was held on August 1, 2011, after which defendant was ordered to pay restitution in the amount of \$53,556.46 as a condition of probation. Defendant appeals from the restitution order.

This court appointed counsel to represent defendant on appeal. On January 26, 2012, appointed counsel filed a brief raising no issues and requesting this court to independently review the record for arguable appellate contentions pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436. Defendant was notified by letter of her right to file a supplemental brief within 30 days. No brief has been received, and the 30-day period to respond has expired.

We have conducted an independent review of the record and conclude there are no arguable issues on appeal. Defendant and the victim expressly stipulated to the amount of restitution at the restitution hearing. There is nothing to suggest any improper influence in obtaining defendant's agreement to the amount of restitution. The judgment is affirmed. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259.)

KRIEGLER, J.

We concur:

TURNER, P. J.

MOSK, J.