

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

JOHN BRYANT,

Defendant and Appellant.

B276121

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. PA085640)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Hilleri G. Merritt, Judge.

Phillip A. Trevino, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Respondent.

On February 3, 2016, Simon Fernandez was overseeing the transfer of items into storage. The items were located in a workshop adjacent to his office, and were being transferred to a nearby building. As part of his work, Fernandez walked back and forth between the two buildings. During these trips, he left his laptop, cell phone and bag on the conference table in the office.

At around 11:20 a.m., Fernandez was walking toward the storage building when he noticed appellant John Bryant near the door to his office. When Fernandez walked back to the office building, he saw appellant coming out of the office. Appellant told Fernandez he was looking for work. Fernandez told appellant to come back inside and talk to the office manager. As Fernandez was escorting appellant, he saw appellant pull out a laptop from under his sweatshirt and place it on a nearby cement ledge. Fernandez recognized it as his own laptop. Appellant apologized and stated he had a drug problem. He also confessed to stealing Fernandez's cell phone, which he had hidden underneath a nearby bush. When police officers arrived, appellant told them he had stolen the items to support his crack habit.

A jury convicted appellant of grand theft of personal property. In a bifurcated proceeding, the trial court found true three prison priors. It sentenced appellant to a total of five years in county jail. Appellant timely appealed.

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 February 6, 2017, we advised appellant he had 30 days to file a supplemental letter brief raising any issue he wished this court to consider. No response was received.

This court has examined the entire record in accordance with *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at pages 441 to 442, and is satisfied appellant's attorney has fully complied with the responsibilities of counsel, and no arguable issues exist. Accordingly, we affirm.

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL
REPORTS**

MANELLA, J.

We concur:

WILLHITE, Acting P.J.

COLLINS, J.