

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

LEONARD ALFONSO BROWN,

Defendant and Appellant.

B236604

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. A919680)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, James R. Brandlin, Judge. Affirmed.

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

No appearance for Respondent.

The record contains no information regarding the underlying facts in this action. In June 1987, a two-count felony complaint was filed charging appellant Leonard Alfonso Brown with selling or transporting cocaine (Health & Saf. Code, § 11352) and with possessing it for sale (Health & Saf. Code, § 11351). The complaint and information also included weight allegations as restrictions on probation. (Pen. Code, § 1203.07, subds. (a)(1), (a)(2).)¹ Brown pleaded guilty to the possession charge and was sentenced to a three-year term in state prison.

In August 2011, Brown (then in federal custody in Florida), filed a petition entitled “Petition for Nunc Pro Tunc,” asking the court to clarify and correct certain records pertaining to his conviction which he claimed were erroneous. These records (which are not included in our appellate record) purportedly referred to case numbers A781940 and A795097 which, according to Brown, involved not him, but an individual named Stefan Harris. The court denied the petition on the grounds that it was both untimely and failed to establish prejudice.

We appointed counsel to represent Brown on appeal. After examination of the record, Brown’s counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues, and asking this court to independently review the record. February 23, 2012, we advised Brown he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. To date, we have received no response.

Having examined the entire record we are satisfied that Brown’s counsel has fully complied with his responsibilities, and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 109–110; *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

¹ In the Information, the weight allegation incorrectly identifies the controlled substance as heroin, rather than cocaine.

DISPOSITION

The order is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

JOHNSON, J.

We concur:

ROTHSCHILD, Acting P. J.

CHANEY, J.