

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS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 This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.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

JESSE GONZALEZ,

Defendant and Appellant.

B243522

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. GA082967)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. Wade Olson, Judge. Affirmed.

Ann Krausz, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Appellant Jesse Gonzalez was charged with possession of methamphetamine, in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11377, subdivision (a), and with misdemeanor possession of a smoking device, in violation of Health and Safety Code section 11364.1. It was alleged that appellant had been convicted of a serious or violent felony within the meaning of the "Three Strikes" law (Pen. Code, §§ 667, subds. (b)-(i), 1170.12, subds. (a)-(d)), and that he had suffered prior convictions pursuant to Penal Code sections 667.5, subdivision (b) and 1203, subdivision (e)(4).

Appellant waived his constitutional rights to a trial, pled no contest to possession of methamphetamine and admitted the prior strike allegation. The trial court also found appellant in violation of probation in superior court case number GA082967. In that case, appellant had pled no contest to receipt of stolen property, in violation of Penal Code section 496d, subdivision (a). In July 2011, the execution of sentence was suspended and appellant was placed on three years formal probation.

On June 20, 2012, the trial court imposed the agreed-upon sentence of 2 years and 8 months, selecting the lower term of 16 months, doubled. In case number GA082967, the court imposed a concurrent two-year sentence. Appellant received 393 days of pre-sentence credit.

Appellant filed a timely notice of appeal, which states that "This appeal is based on the sentence or other matters occurring after the plea that do not affect the validity of the plea." We appointed counsel to represent him on this appeal.

After examination of the record, appellant's counsel filed an opening brief pursuant to *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, and requested that this court conduct an independent review of the entire appellate record to determine whether any arguable issues exist. On January 22, 2013, we advised appellant that 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.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that appellant's attorney has fully complied with her responsibilities and that 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

ARMSTRONG, J.

We concur:

TURNER, P. J.

KRIEGLER, J.