

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

LAVELLE SHUNTEL GARRISON,

Defendant and Appellant.

B247234

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. YA082199)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Mark S. Arnold, Judge. Affirmed.

Steven A. Brody, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Appellant Lavelle Shuntel Garrison pled guilty to possession of methamphetamine, (Health & Saf. Code, § 11377, subd. (a)) pursuant to a negotiated plea agreement. The trial court suspended imposition of sentence and placed appellant on formal probation for a period of 686 days with the first 321 days in county jail.<sup>1</sup> Another condition of appellant's probation was that he obey all laws.

On December 26, 2012, a motion to revoke probation was filed. On February 19, 2013, a hearing was held pursuant to *People v. Vickers* (1972) 8 Cal.3d 451. The court found appellant in violation of probation, revoked probation, and imposed a term of two years in state prison.

### FACTS

On December 14, 2012, appellant and his girlfriend Patricia Medina, were on their way to the beach when an argument ensued. Appellant grabbed Medina by her neck and said he wanted to kill her. Someone flagged down the police. Medina told police officers about the incident, and also told them appellant had been violent toward her before.

Appellant testified at the probation revocation hearing. He denied he choked Medina. Appellant said Medina had hit him on many occasions.

### DISCUSSION

Appellant filed a timely notice of appeal, and we appointed counsel to represent him on appeal. Appellant's counsel filed an opening brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, and requested this court to independently review the record on appeal to determine whether any arguable issues exist.

On June 27, 2013, we advised appellant he had 30 days in which to personally submit any contentions or issues which he wished us to consider. No response has been received to date.

---

<sup>1</sup> Appellant had a total of 321 days of custody credit. Thus, he had one year of probation remaining at the time of sentencing.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied appellant's attorney has fully complied with his responsibilities and no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 441.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

KUMAR, J.\*

We concur:

MOSK, Acting P.J.

KRIEGLER, J.

---

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