

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

OTILIA CASTRELLON-ZAMORA,

Defendant and Appellant.

B241603

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. BA370844)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,
Dorothy B. Reyes, Judge. Affirmed.

Ann Krausz, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

On January 20, 2011, appellant waived her constitutional rights and pled guilty to one count of conspiracy to transport methamphetamine, in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11378. She was sentenced to the mid-term of three years in state prison. On February 21, 2012, appellant filed a motion to vacate her plea pursuant to Penal Code section 1016.5, contending that the trial judge did not advise her of the immigration consequences of the plea, as required by that statute. On April 13, 2012, the trial court denied the motion.

Appellant filed a timely notice of appeal, specifically appealing the denial of her motion to vacate her plea. After examining the record, appointed appellate counsel filed a brief raising no issues, but asking this court to independently review the record on appeal pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441-442. (See *Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 264.) On October 9, 2012, we sent a letter to appellant's last known address (Eloy Detention Center), advising appellant she had 30 days within which to submit by brief or letter any contentions or argument she wished this court to consider. The letter was returned with the annotation "Unclaimed/Not in Custody."

Appellant does not dispute that the prosecutor informed her of the immigration consequences of her plea in open court, with the trial judge present. This was sufficient to satisfy the court's obligations under Penal Code section 1016.5. (*People v. Quesada* (1991) 230 Cal.App.3d 525, 535-536.) This court has examined the entire record in accordance with *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at pages 441-442, and is satisfied appellant's attorney has fully complied with the responsibilities of counsel, and no arguable issues exist. Accordingly, we affirm the judgment of conviction.

DISPOSITION

The judgment of conviction is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS.

MANELLA, J.

We concur:

EPSTEIN, P. J.

SUZUKAWA, J.