

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

LUIS RUBEN PAZ,

Defendant and Appellant.

2d Crim. No. B297466
(Super. Ct. No. 1503837)
(Santa Barbara County)

Luis Ruben Paz appeals from an order denying his motion to quash a warrant and suppress evidence.

A confidential informant did a controlled buy of heroin from Paz's son outside of Paz's residence. The deputies obtained a search warrant for Paz's residence, and Paz was inside his apartment during the search. The deputies found heroin and about \$14,000 in the bedroom closet, a loaded firearm in a bedroom dresser, and ammunition in another closet. Paz said the bedroom was "his and his only" and that he was the only one who kept property there.

Paz was charged with possession of heroin for sale (Health & Saf. Code, § 11351), possession of heroin with a firearm (Health & Saf. Code, § 11370.1, subd. (a)), and possession of a firearm and ammunition by a felon (Pen. Code, §§ 29800, subd. (a)(1), 30305, subd. (a)(1)). Paz filed a motion to quash the search warrant and suppress the evidence obtained pursuant to execution of the warrant. Paz argued the supporting affidavit did not establish probable cause. The trial court denied the motion.

Paz pled no contest to all counts. The trial court suspended imposition of sentence and granted probation with conditions, which included 270 days in jail.

We appointed counsel to represent Paz in this appeal. After counsel's examination of the record, he filed an opening brief raising no issues. On October 3, 2019, we advised Paz that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues that he wished to raise on appeal. We have not received a response.

We have reviewed the entire record and are satisfied that Paz's attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issue exists. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

The order is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

TANGEMAN, J.

We concur:

GILBERT, P. J.

PERREN, J.

James K. Voysey, Judge

Superior Court County of Santa Barbara

Richard B. Lennon, under appointment by the Court
of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.