

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE
OF CALIFORNIA,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

CHARLENE MARSHALL,

Defendant and Appellant.

B284662

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. MA070063)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Christopher G. Estes, Judge. Affirmed.

Karen Hunter Bird for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance by Plaintiff and Respondent.

INTRODUCTION

Defendant Charlene Marshall appeals her conviction for grand theft following a bench trial. Appointed counsel on appeal filed an opening brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 (*Wende*). We affirm.

FACTS AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

On November 13, 2017, defendant stole \$5,200 in cash, a bank card, and a cell phone from a woman's unattended purse. On March 13, 2017, the People charged defendant in an information with one count of grand theft. At the bench trial, testimony from police officers established that defendant was seen on security camera footage taking items from the victim's purse, that defendant admitted to taking items from victim's purse, and that victim's cell phone was found in defendant's mother's possession. Testimony from the victim and others showed that the victim had \$5,200 in her purse from selling a car earlier that day.

The court sentenced defendant to three years of formal felony probation. The court ordered defendant to serve nine days in custody with nine days of credit and 20 days of community labor. The court ordered defendant to pay fines and to make restitution in the amount of \$5,200.

On August 18, 2017, defendant filed a timely notice of appeal. On March 9, 2018, her appointed counsel filed a brief pursuant to *Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436, in which no issues were raised. The brief included a declaration from counsel that she reviewed the record and sent defendant a letter advising her that such a brief would be filed and that she could file a supplemental brief if she chose to. That same day, this court sent defendant a letter advising her that a *Wende* brief had been filed and that she had 30 days to submit a brief raising any issues she wanted us to consider. Defendant did not file a supplemental brief.

DISPOSITION

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that defendant's attorney fully complied with her responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*Smith v. Robbins* (2000) 528 U.S. 259; *Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d 436.). We affirm the judgment.

RUBIN, ACTING P. J.

WE CONCUR:

GRIMES, J.

ROGAN, J.*

* Judge of the Orange Superior Court, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.