

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

DAKOTA DICKENS,

Defendant and Appellant.

B284274

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. MA069826)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Charles A. Chung, Judge. Affirmed.

Tracy L. Emblem, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

---

Dakota Dickens (Dickens) appeals from a conviction for three robberies in the first degree, five robberies in the second degree, and possession of a controlled substance. (Pen. Code, §§ 211, 212.5;<sup>1</sup> Health & Saf. Code, § 11377.)

The police arrested Dickens in connection with a spree of similar robberies that occurred during the period October 23 to 27, 2016. In each instance, Dickens and an unidentified accomplice spotted their victims at automated teller machines; they would wait for the victims to finish their banking transactions then follow them to their homes. While the victims were still in their cars (either parked on the street, in a driveway or inside their garages) or having just exited their cars, Dickens and his accomplice would rush up to the victims and rob them at gunpoint.

At trial, seven of the eight victims testified.<sup>2</sup> Four of the victims definitively identified Dickens as their robber. A fifth victim, who identified Dickens in a photographic lineup shortly after she was robbed with “50/50” certainty, made a tentative identification of him at trial, but qualified her testimony with the admission that she was “worried” that the robbers knew where she lived. Among other things, the People presented evidence that Dickens was arrested with one of the victim’s cell phones in his pocket. Our review confirms that substantial evidence supported each count of conviction. When the People asked

---

<sup>1</sup> All further statutory references are to the Penal Code unless otherwise indicated.

<sup>2</sup> Although there were eight robbery victims, there were only six incidents—four of which were single-victim incidents; the two remaining incidents each involved two victims. The one victim who did not testify was involved in a two-victim incident.

Dickens's mother what he told her about the robberies, she testified as follows: "It's really something we don't discuss [that] often. Just the fact that he wishes he didn't do it. That whatever decision he made, that he wishes he could have changed it. And he has apologized to me for hurting me."

On May 3, 2017, after a day of deliberation, the jury found Dickens guilty on all counts. On June 2, 2017, the trial court sentenced Dickens to a total of 13 years and eight months in prison. Dickens timely appealed.

On November 13, 2017, we appointed counsel to represent Dickens. On February 16, 2018, after examining the record, his counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues and asking this court to independently review the record.

On February 20, 2018, we advised Dickens that he had 30 days in which to submit any contentions or issues he wished us to consider. To date, we have received no response.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that Dickens's counsel has fully complied with her 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.)

#### **DISPOSITION**

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

JOHNSON, J.

We concur:

ROTHSCHILD, P. J.

BENDIX, J.