

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

CLINTON SCOTT HAMPTON,

Defendant and Appellant.

B239710

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. MA054055)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County,
Richard E. Naranjo, Judge. Affirmed.

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

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Clinton Scott Hampton was charged in an information with one count of second degree burglary (Pen. Code, § 459),¹ with special allegations he had suffered one prior serious or violent felony conviction within the meaning of the “Three Strikes” law (§§ 1170.12, subds. (a)-(d); 667, subds. (b)-(i)) and had served two separate prison terms for felonies (§ 667.5, subd. (b)).

According to the evidence at trial, on the morning of August 25, 2011, Wal-Mart loss prevention officers noticed Hampton carrying a Wal-Mart shopping bag inside the store. As they watched, Hampton selected two packets of Pokemon cards from store shelves, placed them in the bag before returning them to the store’s service desk in exchange for a Wal-Mart gift card. Hampton was thereafter detained.

A jury convicted Hampton as charged. In a bifurcated proceeding, Hampton admitted the special allegations. After denying Hampton’s motion to strike his prior conviction pursuant to section 1385 and *People v. Superior Court (Romero)* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 497, the trial court sentenced him to an aggregate state prison term of six years, consisting of the three-year middle term for second degree burglary doubled under the Three Strikes law. The court stayed the two one-year enhancements as to the prior prison terms. Hampton was awarded 261 days of presentence credit (154 actual days and 107 days of conduct credit). The court also imposed a \$1,200 restitution fine, a \$40 court security fee, a \$30 criminal conviction assessment and a \$10 crime prevention fine. The court imposed and suspended a \$1,200 parole revocation fine pursuant to section 1202.45.

We appointed counsel to represent Hampton on appeal.

After examination of the record, counsel filed an opening brief in which no issues were raised. On October 26, 2012, we advised Hampton he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. No response has been received to date.

1 Statutory references are to the Penal Code.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied Hampton's attorney has fully complied with the responsibilities of counsel and no arguable issues exist. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259, 277-284 [120 S.Ct. 746, 145 L.Ed.2d 756]; *People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 112-113; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

The judgment is affirmed.

WOODS, J.

We concur:

PERLUSS, P. J.

ZELON, J.