

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

LEMUEL HENDERSON,

Defendant and Appellant.

2d Crim. No. B266971
(Super. Ct. No. BA432016)
(Los Angeles County)

Lemuel Henderson appeals his conviction by jury of petty theft with a prior theft related conviction. (Pen. Code, § 666, subd. (a).)¹ The trial court granted a motion to strike a prior strike conviction (*People v. Superior Court (Romero)* (1996) 13 Cal.4th 497) and sentenced appellant to the low term of 16 months state prison. Appellant's Proposition 47 petition to reduce the felony conviction to a misdemeanor was denied because appellant had a prior conviction for an offense requiring registration as a sex offender. (See §§ 1170.18, subd. (i); 290, subd. (c); *People v. Shabazz* (2015) 237 Cal.App.4th 303, 308 & fn. 2.) The trial court ordered appellant to pay a \$40 court operations assessment (§ 1465.8, subd. (a)(1)), a \$30 criminal conviction assessment (Gov. Code, § 70373), a \$300 restitution fine (§ 1202.4, subd. (b)), and a \$300 parole restitution fine (§ 1202.45).

¹All statutory references are to the Penal Code unless otherwise stated.

We appointed counsel to represent appellant in this appeal. After examination of the record, counsel filed an opening brief in which no issues were raised.

On April 19, 2016, we advised appellant that he had 30 days in which to personally submit any contentions that he wished to raise on appeal. We have received no response from appellant.

The evidence shows that appellant entered the El Tapatio supermarket on December 4, 2014 and stole meat, liquor, and toiletries. Appellant was detained with the items outside the store by a loss prevention officer.

Having undertaken an examination of the entire record, we find no arguable error that would result in a disposition more favorable to appellant. We are satisfied that appointed counsel has fully complied with his responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 125-126; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441-442.)

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

YEGAN, J.

We concur:

GILBERT, P. J.

TANGEMAN, J.

Richard S. Kemalyan, Judge
Superior Court County of Los Angeles

Jonathan B. Steiner, Joshua Schraer, under appointment by the Court of
Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.